JOURNAL

OF THE

AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY

EDITED BY

W. NORMAN BROWN
University of Pennsylvania

JOHN K. SHRYOCK
University of Pennsylvania

E. A. SPEISER
University of Pennsylvania

VOLUME 53 · NUMBER 2 · JUNE, 1933

Published June 30, 1933

CONTENTS

MONTGOMERY, J. A.: Notes on the Mythological Epic Texts from Ras Shamra, ... 97

EMENEAU, M. B.: Kṣemendra as *kavi*, ... 124

HAMILTON, C. H.: K'uei Chi's Commentary on Wei-shih-er-shih-lun, ... 144

KRAELING, C. H.: The Mandaic God Ptahil, ... 152

BRIEF NOTE: Kent, ... 166

REVIEWS OF BOOKS: *Bauer, Das Alphabet von Ras Schamra: seine Entzifferung und seine Gestalt* (Montgomery); Mercer, *Études sur les Origines de la Religion d'Egypte* (Barton); Mingana, *Woodbrooke Studies, Vol. III: 1. Vision of Theophilus; 2. Apocalypse of Peter; Vol. V: Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Nicene Creed* (Vaschalde); Smith, *Studies in Early Mysticism in the Near and Middle East;* Haig, *Comparative Tables of Muhammadan and Christian Dates* (Spoer); Thackeray, *Josephus the Man and the Historian* (Cohon); Buckler and Robinson, *Sardis, VII, 1, Greek and Latin Inscriptions* (Hyde); Dutt, *Origin and Growth of Caste in India;* Ghurye, *Caste and Race in India;* O'Malley, *Indian Caste Customs*; Abbott, *The Keys of Power* (Briggs); Cousens, *Somanātha and Other Mediaeval Temples in Kāṭhiāwāḍ*; Gravely and Ramachandran, *Catalogue of the South Indian Metal Images in the Madras Government Museum* (Coomaraswamy), ... 167

NOTES OF THE SOCIETY, ... 189

PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY

ADDRESS, CARE OF

YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS

NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT, U. S. A.

Books for review should be sent to one of the Editors (addresses on the inside of this cover)
Annual subscriptions and orders should be sent to the American Oriental Society, care of Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., U. S. A.
(See last page of cover.)

Entered as second-class matter June 1, 1916, at the post office at New Haven, Connecticut under the Act of August 24, 1912. Published quarterly.

American Oriental Society

FOUNDED 1842

OFFICERS FOR 1933–34

President—Professor RICHARD J. H. GOTTHEIL, of New York
(Address: Columbia University, New York, N. Y.)
Vice-Presidents—Mr. EDWARD T. NEWELL, of New York
Dr. CHARLES J. OGDEN, of New York
Professor EDWARD CHIERA, of Chicago
Corresponding Secretary—Professor LE ROY CARR BARRET, of Hartford
(Address: Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.)
Recording Secretary—Dr. LUDLOW BULL, of New York
(Address: Metropolitan Museum, New York)
Treasurer—Professor JOHN C. ARCHER, of New Haven
(Address: Yale Station, New Haven, Conn.)
Librarian—Professor ANDREW KEOGH, of New Haven
(Address: Yale University, New Haven, Conn.)
Editors of the Journal—Professor W. NORMAN BROWN, of Philadelphia
(Address: University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.)
Dr. JOHN KNIGHT SHRYOCK, of Philadelphia
(Address: University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.)
Professor EPHRAIM A. SPEISER, of Philadelphia
(Address: University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.)
Directors—The officers above named and the President and Secretary of the Middle West Branch, *ex officio*, and:
Term expiring 1934: Professor RAYMOND P. DOUGHERTY, Dr. BERTHOLD LAUFER, Professor THEOPHILE J. MEEK
Term expiring 1935: Professor JAMES A. MONTGOMERY, Professor EDGAR H. STURTEVANT, Dr. ARTHUR W. HUMMEL
Term expiring 1936: Professor ALBERT TEN EYCK OLMSTEAD, Professor HAROLD H. BENDER, Professor KENNETH S. LATOURETTE
The Executive Committee—The President, Corresponding Secretary, and Treasurer *ex officio*, and Professor BENDER and Dr. HUMMEL
Committee on Arrangements for 1934—To be appointed
Committee on Nominations for 1934—Professor MEEK, Dr. HUMMEL, and Professor JOSHI
Auditors for 1934—Professors DOUGHERTY and LATOURETTE
Committee on Publication—The Treasurer, the Librarian, and the Editors of the Journal, *ex officiis*
Representative on American Schools of Oriental Research—Professor OLMSTEAD
Delegates to the American Council of Learned Societies—Professors EDGERTON and SCHMIDT

The next meeting of the Society will be held during Easter week, 1934.

MIDDLE WEST BRANCH

Established 1917

OFFICERS FOR 1933–34

President—Professor THEOPHILE J. MEEK, of Toronto
(Address: University of Toronto, Toronto, Ont.)
Vice-President—Professor FRANCIS M. BUCKLER, of Oberlin
Secretary-Treasurer—Professor OVID R. SELLERS, of Chicago
(Address: 846 Chalmers Place, Chicago, Ill.)
Members of the Executive Committee—Professor CHARLES S. BRADEN and Mr. J. ARTHUR MACLEAN

NOTES ON THE MYTHOLOGICAL EPIC TEXTS FROM RAS SHAMRA

JAMES A. MONTGOMERY
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

I.

M. VIROLLEAUD has followed up his publication in January 1932 of a Hebraic mythological text written in a cuneiform alphabet with another text of similar import published also in the past year. These, along with the small tablets of similar nature published by him in 1930, constitute an epoch-making discovery in the letters of Syria, with all that this implies for our knowledge of early Hebrew and in general of Syrian culture and religion for the fourteenth century B. C. M. Virolleaud is to be applauded for his generous and prompt publication of the text, and scholarship must equally appraise the splendid contributions made by Messrs. Bauer and Dhorme in their decipherment of the new alphabet.[1]

---

[1] Virolleaud's successive publications have appeared in *Syria*, in vols. X, 304 ff., XII, 193 ff., XIII, 113 ff., along with a "Note complémentaire" to the first Epic, XII, 359 ff. (He is cited below under the serial numbers of *Syria*, X, etc.) H. Bauer, the first to attempt decipherment of the novel script (*Entzifferung der Keilschrifttafeln von Ras Schamra*, 1930), has since published a brochure entitled *Das Alphabet von Ras Schamra*, 1932 (date of preface September, 1932), in which he gives a full bibliography to date. This work concerns itself chiefly with the small tablets, but the valuable philological remarks also extend to the first Epic. (A review by the present writer will appear early in this *Journal*. My references to Bauer in the following pages are to this second volume.) Essays at the interpretation and translation of the first Epic have been made by W. F. Albright in *Bulletin, ASOR*, April, 1932, enlarged into the valuable study appearing in *JPOS* 1932, 185 ff. (his study of the second Epic is announced to appear in the *Bulletin*, no. 47); G. A. Barton in this *Journal*, 1932, 221 ff. Similar studies are given by J. P. Naish in *PEFQS* 1932, 154 ff., and in two articles which have come too late to hand for me to use; T. H. Gaster, "The Combat of Death and the Most High", *JRAS* Oct. 1932; H. A. Ginzberg, a study of the first Epic in the current volume of the Hebrew journal *Tarbīṣ*, 106 ff. I note also the valuable philological notes by Baneth in *OLZ* 1932, 449 ff., and two important articles by Hrozny, "Une inscription hurrite de Ras-Šamra en langue hurrite", *Archiv Orientální*, Apr. 1932, 118 ff., "Les Ioniens à Ras-Šamra", *Archiv f. Orientkunde*, 1932, 1699 ff.

For the second "Epic" (rather Épopée) only Virolleaud's treatment is known to me. This text is more obscure than the first, and on first sight appeared less interesting than the other. However more intensive study discovers matters of vast interest bearing upon the cult, while a few historical and geographical clues, including the colophon naming "Nḳmd king of Ugarit", are most valuable. Withal we are given a larger field for philological observation, and comparison of the two texts helps to clear up obscurities in both. We await with impatience the fresh material as yet unpublished, to which the eminent French editor refers and from which he occasionally cites.

The first necessary attempts at interpretation have been made and foundations established. In this article I do not propose a fresh translation, for I have not gained from the obscure and dilapidated texts a comprehension that satisfies me, much less one that I can unload upon the world. I purpose to give: (II) some general observations on the literary form and character of the texts; (III) a discussion of the mythology and the motifs of what are doubtless ritual texts; (IV) a series of sporadic Notes, which will present such positive contributions as I think worthy of record for the use and criticism of scholars. The paper is, despite its unexpected length, in no way a full commentary; what I avoid I have nothing to speak upon, and silence does not mean assent to my predecessors.[2]

I have nothing to add to the alphabetic identifications made by my predecessors, and the queries they have left still remain mine. I follow the transcription used by Albright (who has correctly identified the character for ẓ). In the Hebrew types I use the following distinctives: ḫ = 𐤧; ẓ = 𐤦; ṯ = 𐤸; the apparent variant for p = 𐤯; the three variants of 𐤀 ('a, 'e, 'e/u?) as 𐤀, 𐤁, 𐤂. On the uncertainty as between the sounds of 𐤔 and 𐤮 I call attention to the very pertinent remarks of Bauer, pp. 20 ff.

[2] I refer to the first Epic as A, to the second as B, followed with Roman numeral for column, with Arabic for line. In some cases Vir. has numbered the lines consecutively between two successive columns; I find it convenient to keep the columns separate; thus I say "A iv 25", not "A iii-iv 25".

I express not only the pleasure but also the profit I have enjoyed in working over this material with Mr. Z. S. Harris, Instructor in my University, and thank him for his intelligent criticisms. The understanding of the dialogues and motifs especially requires more heads than one.

He notes, e. g., the spellings בקה, חפט, where we expect and where all actually read ש; I note שת for תת "two", B iv 5. Also I would note variations in form of sign for ש, with omission of the upright wedge leaving only the two sloping lateral wedges, e. g., in בשרת A iii 5 +, in שד A i 6 (versus ii 20), etc. For the differentiation of these sibilants at that period see Thureau-Dangin, *Rev. d'Ass.*, 30, 93 ff. (cited to me by Professor Speiser). There was at that time an uncertainty in the discrimination of these sounds which the Phoenician alphabet wisely avoided, although the oral or at least graphic distinction survived in Biblical Hebrew. The small tablets have a larger number of signs so that we must assume a considerable amount of experimentation. A difficulty to be reckoned with is in mis-spellings, some of which Vir. and others have remarked. I have noted about 25 such cases, some of which may be possibly due to the copyist. Parallelism is often a help for such corrections; but this "text criticism" should be used sparingly. Our scribes were still going to school with their new alphabet.

I may add that this cuneiform alphabet appears to have arisen upon suggestion from and in competition with the Phoenician alphabet, which was already in existence; similarly the Persian cuneiform alphabet was an adaptation of the idea of the far-flung Aramaic alphabet to cuneiform. Both attempts failed before the simpler alphabets.

II.

The consecutive sense of these poems is often rendered most obscure by a number of causes in addition to the difficulties arising from their fragmentary character and the novel lexical material; the uncertainty as to gender and number of the verb, the problem as to use of the impf. as narrative tense or futuritive (see Bauer, pp. 66 ff.), the constant problem as to the *persona loquens.* A slight change in the understanding of one word and its syntax or in the assignment of the speaker may make all possible difference.

Albright has first noticed (*JPOS* 206 ff.) the rhythmic character of the texts. Another equally important element is that of repetition, giving the quality of a refrain to the composition. I note the very suggestive article by I. W. Slotki, "The Song of Deborah", *Journ. Th. St.*, July, 1932, pp. 341 ff., in which, following similar essays on the construction of certain Psalms in the

same journal, he elaborates his theory of "Repetition and Antiphony" in that Song, which is nearest in time of all Biblical compositions to our poems. E. g., I note his treatment of the repetitive *crescendo* of vv. 26 f. He supposes that there had taken place a simplification of the original form, the repetitions, musically understood, becoming avoided in the writing, so that we have the original in a somewhat stenographic form. Certainly there can be felt, if not exactly diagnosed, a similarity in poetic rhetoric between our poems and the Song of Deborah, and the discovery heightens our notion of the poetic possibilities of the second pre-Christian millennium.

I cite some cases of such progressive repetitions. A i 15 ff.: Cries El to Lady Asherat-of-the-Sea, "Hear!"—to Lady A., "Give!"; this is repeated in iii 22 ff. Again, A vi 22 ff.: Sun cries to Mot, "Hear!"—to the divine Son Mot, "How wilt thou fight?" B v 120 ff.: Answered Ktṛ and Ḫss, "Hear!"—to Aleyan Baal, "Build!" Now the recognition of this poetic form enables us to interpret the misunderstood syntax of לבתלת ענת A ii 14. Vir. takes ל as prep., but then must eke out the dative with "to Virgin Anat (belongs the decision)". Albr. translates as vocative, this with no support, unless it is found in Arabic *yala-* (Wright, *Arab. Gr.*, 2, p. 152). But the argument runs thus: in l. 11 Anat accosts Mot: "Give me back my brother". And answers Mot, "What doest thou require?"—to Virgin Anat,—i. e., with resumptive dative after "answers". Then in l. 15 Anat responds without introduction: "I will go and hunt every mountain", etc., which certainly cannot be put in Mot's mouth. For the critical importance of the proper interpretation for the understanding of the myth involved see under (III).

This principle of parallelism and repetition is one of the surest keys for interpretation. I give a typical case: In A iii 5 occurs בשרת בני בנות, translated by all, as also by myself, at first (although I could not understand who the "son" is): "Good news, O my son(s) whom I have borne (sc. begotten)". The phrase with its preceding context appears again in the new tablet, B ii 10 f., iii 30 f. I refer to Note at A iii 4 f. for the texts and their comparison. In B Vir. is forced to see that the phrase is a parallel epithet to לטפן אל דפאר, in which position I must follow him (for possible light on the obscure epithet see the Note). In our A text we have the parallelism:

בחלם לטפן אל דפאר
בשרת בני בנות

בחלם is ‖ to בשרת, i. e., the latter is to be analyzed as ב+שרת, and, as I argue in the Note, is to be translated "by the oracle of", parallel to "by the dream of Ltpn".

For other cases of interpretation through parallelism see Notes at A i 5 f., B iv 38 f., iv 41, 43, etc.; also Note at B v 70 ff. for a case where I criticize Vir. without arriving at certain result.

With the intricacy and repetition of the speaking parts the question arises whether we have not to allow a Narrator or Chorus or both. A chorus is suggested by the truly pathetical lines in A ii 4 ff., repeated in 26 ff. (see Note): "While days continue, for days, for months the affection of Anat compels her, like the heart of the wild-cow for her calf, like the ewe for her lamb—so the heart of Anat." Evident connections with the Tammuz ritual will be cited under (III), e. g., the choric cry, "My Brother". In Psalm exegesis we have come to recognize the place of Chorus, Voices, Oracles, in the temple liturgy; and here we may speculate upon the rendering of ἱεροὶ λόγοι, as Lucian calls them, with ample degree of dramatic pomp. This possibility must be reckoned with in the unravelling of the "plots" of our poems; the themes of all such mystery plays are actually very simple, but intelligible only to the initiated spectator who is assisting at a drama, not reading a libretto.

I would query whether we do not discover almost a comic element in B v 120-vi, with the bandying of the terms concerning the construction of the temple (whether windows or not!) between Aleyan and the two genii, the exact words being repeated three times.

III.

The two tablets present a *Wirrwarr* of divine personages and motifs which can only be explained as a result of competition and syncretism of rival cults. The position of Ugarit, in close contact with all the Semitic Hinterland, on the border of Anatolia, facing the Western Sea made it a cosmopolitan nucleus of most diverse peoples and religions; and we actually find in addition to local elements vouched for in Syrian-Phoenician tradition the influences of Babylonian, Arabian and Mediterranean theologies, while many points, obscure names of gods and their localities of "barbarous"

formation, refer us to the influences of Anatolia, for which Hrozny's reading of certain "Hurrite" texts from Ras Shamra are most illuminating.

The supreme deity is El.[3] He is "King, Father of Years", for which attribute we have earlier Biblical parallels than that of "Ancient of Days" which has been cited, while Sanchuniathon and Damascius give evidence for this Ancient God, Kronos-Chronos, Ἦλ ὁ καὶ Κρόνος (Note, A i 8). He is God-King (Note, B i 4 ff.); Most-Wise God (Note, B iv 41), by the grey hairs of whose beard he is adjured (Note, B v 65 f.); "the Baal, Exalted One (מרים = עליון, Sanchuniathon's Μημρουμος — Note, B iv 19) of the North (צפן)." The identification of the Mount of the North with the Classical Mons Casius, the modern el-Akraʿ, the lofty promontory to the north of Ras Shamra has already been established.[4] This high peak was a localization of the northern Olympus, to which proud Ashur aspired to ascend, Is. 14:13; and ideally Mount Sion was like the mythical Olympus in the enthusiasm of her devotees— "Sion in the recesses of the North", Ps. 48:3. For Tyre it was "the Holy Mount of God", Eze. 28:14.

El also appears as localized at other points (for such localizations of the High God cf. Alt's monograph, *Der Gott der Väter*). Of interest is the El-of-Ẓzr, or Ẓṣr, who appears at A vi 31, B vii 47, viii 32, with Ẓṣr in another combination in B viii 4. I consulted Professor Speiser about the identification of such a possible locality, and he promptly named Zinzar, occurring in a Tell el-Amarna

[3] For a summary of the deities discovered in the small Tablets, see Bauer, pp. 36 ff., and his excursus on the names Mot and Aleyan, pp. 71 ff. Cf. the list of deities by whom adjuration is made in the Aramaic stele of Sudshin, near Aleppo, among whom appear אל ועלין (Bauer, *AfO* 1932, 1 ff.; cf. Cantineau, *Rev. d'Ass.*, 1931, 167 ff.).

[4] See Baedeker, *Palestine*, 1906, p. 357, which gives its altitude at 1770 m. A photograph of it appears in Dussaud, *La Syrie antique et médiévale illustrée*, pl. 64. It is said that the eastern point of Cyrus can be seen from its top lying like a great triangle in the sea. Baal-Sapon is listed in an inscription of Esarhaddon as one of the gods of King Baal king of Tyre; and in an inscription of Tiglath-pileser III (*Annals*, 127) as a mountain in Lebanon, so also in Sargon's Annals (l. 204; I owe the references to Professor Speiser). A Baalat-Sapon appears in an Egyptian text, Müller, *As. u. Eur.*, 315. Sapon also appears as a deity in the small Tablets, Bauer, p. 37. The deity had a sanctuary on the borders of Egypt, Ex. 14:2. I find the best description of the mountain given in the *Handbook of Syria* (University Press, Oxford, n. d.), p. 328.

tablet, Knudtzon, no. 53. (For the dissimilation he compares Izalla > Inzalla in Nuzi tablets.) It appears also in the records of the Middle Kingdom as an important strategic point, as Sezar or Senzar: Breasted, *Records of Egypt,* under Thutmosis III, § 584, under Amenhotep II, § 798a. The place was early identified with Sheizar, a strategic point in the Orontes valley (to the SE of Ras Shamra), the Greek Larissa, and famous in the Middle Ages. And Dr. Speiser supplementarily reports to me the occurrence of the place-name in a long list of such names in a Hittite text (Forrer, *Reallex. d. Ass.,* 100b), in which Zinzirra follows immediately upon Ugaritta; this appears to be a clinching proof.[5] For other localized deities I may note names compounded with Ẓr, Heb. צור, "Rock", an ancient Semitic epithet for deity (Note, B viii 1 ff.). In B i 4 ff. some further deities with their sanctuaries are named; see Note.

The plural of El, אלם, is used to express plurality, as at B vii 50, "divinities and men"; B iv 51, "like the divinities, like the sons of Asherat", and in the interesting phrase, "the assembly of the divinities", B iii 13 (Note); and as well in the abstract sense of deity, so Mot is בן אלם, in exactly the same sense as בר אלהין, Dan. 3:25 (see my *Comm. ad loc.*), and the Biblical בני אלם. At times there is uncertainty as between sing. and pl. (as in Biblical grammar in the syntax of אלהים); we find נרת אל "the Flame of Deity" once, A iii 24, else נ' אלם. For these Elim cf. Sanchuniathon, in Eusebius, *Praep. ev.,* i. 10, 37b (I follow Gifford's text here and below): *οἱ σύμμαχοι Ἥλου τοῦ Κρόνου Ἐλωείμ ἐπεκλήθησαν* (see Gifford's note). The pl. אלהם also appears in the small Tablets, no. 3, ll. 12, 18.

Next in importance among the gods accessory to the drama of Aleyan is the enigmatic לטפן אל דפאר, "Lṭpn-god-of-P'ed", who appears as identical with תר אל אבך הות לטפן (הות obscure) A iv 34, תראל A vi 26, B iv 47, and תראל דפאר B i 4 +, also simply as תר B iv 30 (by error?), "Lṭpn" disappearing in B. Their identity is further established by Lṭpn's cognomen בני בנות, attributed to Ṯr-El, B i 10 +. Ṯr-El evidently means Bull of El—

[5] See also Meyer, *GA*[2] ii, pt. 1, and Olmstead, *Pal. and Syria,* in Index. For photographs of the ruined Arabic castle at Sheizar see Dussaud, *op. cit.,* pl. 104, and the frontispiece to the two respective volumes of Hitti's text and translation of the *Examples* of Uṣáma ibn Munḳidh, whose home Sheizar was.

of what provenance this title is we do not know; it is speculation to think of Hadad's bull, of the Minotaur, of Anatolian bull deities (for which latter see Frazer, *Adonis*, 79 f.). As *'abbir* the Hebrew God once bore similar title. He is, if the dialogue be read aright, son of El-Melek, B iv 47 +, and apparently father of Mot, A vi 26 +; also A iv 34 may make him father of the Flame of Sun. Ltpn is a "master of dreams" as argued under (II).

Dagan (Dagon) appears as father of Aleyan, A i 23 f., a proper parent for the corn-god. 'Aṯtar appears once, at the end of A i, where he assumes the throne of the vanished Aleyan. This male 'Aṯtar connects with the S. Arabian religion; Albright notes its occurrence in the name of a prince of Taanach.

Of the two divine champions Mot and Aleyan, the former has already been placed; see Paton at end of his article, "Canaanites", *ERE* 3, 182, and Bauer, pp. 71 ff. He is son of Ṯr-El, as observed above, and (if I understand the syntax) of Asherat, A v 1. In addition to his constant title as "Ben Elim", he is also מרד אֵל "friend of El", this attribution appearing clearly in B viii 23. For Aleyan's similar title "Beloved" see below. The title Baal is never applied to him. He disappears after text A until B vii, viii, where his cult is rival to Aleyan's.

For the pronunciation "Alēyān" I refer to Albright's remarks.[6] A foreign origin might be claimed for this deity on account of the novelty of his name and its occurrence in a list of gods in the "inscription hurrite" (Tab. 2), commented on by Hrozny, pp. 122, 126, where it is spelt אלן and אלאן. In B viii 34 is found אלאֵי; evidently the word underwent transformations. But as Aleyan is son of the good Semitic goddess Anat, I suggest the following process of identification. There are two Phoenician names known from the Greek, Mygdalion and Pygmalion. In the latter name the first element Pygm represents the obscure god-name פעם, which appears in composition with נעם = Adonis in the name נעמפעם, i. e. פעם = נעם = Alion. For the phonetic development of

[6] P. 190. His precising of the final vowel is doubtless correct, and I follow his pronunciation. Final -ān > -ōn > -ūn is characteristic of antique personal and local names throughout Syria-Palestine; the same element appears in *nn. pr.* in S. Arabia and N. Arabia, e. g., the names in Gen. 36. It appears to have been a suffix expressing distinction, and so may be identical with -(ā)n, which in South-Arabic has the force of the article. I see no reason for fusion or confusion of our word with 'Elyon.

"Aleyan" and its possible etymology I refer to the note below. We thus obtain historical argument for the identification of Aleyan with Adonis, which our texts enforce. Vir., xii, 356, n. 3, claims from an unpublished fragment the occurrence of אדן "Adonis" || to נעמן.[7]

Aleyan's current title is Baal; also he appears as "Baal of the earth", A iii 9, as חרן (Note, B v 97), as "our King and Judge", B iv 43. His most interesting epithet is ידד, "Beloved", either sole, or as the "Beloved of the El of Zinzar"—evidently indicating a particular local cult at that place on the Orontes; see Note, A vi 30 ff. With this title we make connection with Phoenician mythological sources. Eusebius cites from Porphyry—and he in turn doubtless from Sanchuniathon—as follows (10c-d—I follow Gifford's translation): "Kronos then, whom the Phoenicians call El, subsequently after his decease was deified as the star Saturn; and he had by a nymph of the country named Anobret an only-begotten son, whom on this account they called Ιεδουδ, the only-begotten, being still so-called among the Phoenicians; and when very great dangers from war beset the country, he arrayed the son in royal apparel and prepared an altar and sacrificed him." For Ιεδουδ, "beloved", it is to be observed that Gifford prefers this reading to the usual Ιεουδ.[8] We thus discover a background for

[7] For these names see Cooke, *NSI* 55. For the names Mygdalion, Pygmalion Schröder, *Phön. Sprache*, 102, in a paragraph on "Mouillierung" in Phoen. words, argues that -alion is derived from 'alōn "god". But the initial vowel is not what is desired for the latter. Accepting with him the principle of "Mouillierung", we may regard our name as developed out of 'allōn, and this is then identical with the same Heb. word for "oak", with its peculiar form as distinct from the more frequent 'ēlōn; 'allōn is used especially of sacred trees, Gen. 35:8, Hos. 4:13, and would be a most appropriate name for this deity of vegetation. The intruded א in our word is comparable to the same phenomenon in צואר; see my explanation, *JAOS* 1926, 58.

[8] The latter indeed as representing Heb. יחיד "only" suits the context better, but the vocalization—*ουδ* better falls in with יָדִיד || יָדוּד. "Only-begotten" and "beloved" are synonymous; cf. Gen. 22:2, "Take thy son, thine only son, whom thou lovest", a passage that has long been compared with the Phoenician legend. The root ידד in Heb. proper names is well known; the noun יד occurs at B iv 38 (see Note). The fame of the Beloved still survives in the place-name Sheikh Ma'sūḳ near Tyre (Baudissin, *Adonis*, 86). With this epithet for Aleyan the title of Mot as מדראל

this obscure figure in Phoenician legend. Is the nymph, the mother of the latter's hero, of equally obscure name, to be connected with Anat, Anobret representing possibly Anat-rabbat, "Lady Anat"?

The identification of Aleyan as a corn-god was promptly recognized. In addition to the known arguments I call attention to my Note B vii 43, arguing that another epithet of his, אַב, is a title of Aleyan as "the blossom". It has been noted by the commentators that the Tammuz-rite reported for the Harranian Pagans in the Arabic *Fihrist*[9] reads almost word for word with the commission of Anat to destroy Mot in A ii 30 ff., this being repeated in a less intelligible passage at A v 11 ff. But the interpreters have not recognized that we have here a satirical use of the terminology of the corn-god rites. Just as Aleyan had been treated, we assume, "split with the sword, winnowed in a sieve, burnt in fire, ground in the mill, sown in the field"—so Mot is to have his "fate", but not with a resurrection; the end of his passion shall be that "the birds shall eat his flesh, his fate to complete" (I follow Albright in the latter phrase). The eating by the birds of his flesh means death for Mot, whose name is Death. We may compare Goliath's challenge to David: "Come to me and I will give thy flesh to the birds of the air and to the beasts of the field." We find here a fine piece of sarcastic *saj'*, with which we may compare Song of Deborah, vv. 25 ff. By the ordinary interpretation Aleyan and Mot are sadly confused.

The female divinities play the liveliest part in our texts, as is common in mythology. The word for goddess is אַלַת, a standing epithet for Asherat. The pl. אַלַהת appears at B vi 47 ff. (see Note). Baalat does not occur in these texts, although frequent in Phoenician inscriptions; it appears in Egyptian form in a New Kingdom text, actually in the divine name Baalat of Saphon (Müller, *As. u. Eur.*, 315).

Anat may take first place as Aleyan's patroness. The well-known information about her need not be repeated here. There may be noted the nominal identification of Anat and Athene in a bilingual

---

stands in rivalry. The component appears in Heb. in the proper name Mēdad (Sam., Gr. Mōdad), Num. 11: 26, while Modad's colleague Eldad has a name of similar formation.

[9] See the full citation in Frazer, *Adonis*, 131, and Baudissin, *Adonis*, 111, cf. 114.

Cypriote inscription (Cooke, no. 28) and Anat-Athene was worshipped in Laodicea, hard by Ugarit (Farnell, *Cults*, ii, 654, 749 note). Her actual identity with Ishtar-Venus is established by the interpretation of A ii 4 ff. given under (II). There is the pathetic description of Anat's affection, like the mother-animal; then, ll. 9 ff., there is exhibited, not an act of violence against Mot on her part, "seizing him by the shoe", etc., but an act of supplication: "she takes hold of his shoe, at the end of lamenting she addresses him: Mot, give me back my brother! Mot (roughly) answers Virgin Anat: Why dost thou seek him. (She responds:) I will go and hunt every mountain in the land, every hill in the steppes; my soul suffers loss more than human kind, my soul weeps" (Note, A ii 17 ff.). This offers the scene we desiderate, the goddess's lament and search for Adonis, and so our text offers the earliest known form of the Syrian myth-legend. And thus we can explain Anat's naming of Aleyan as "my brother" in the above passage, and its evident repetition as a ritual cry in B viii 38-40; it is the euphemistic name for lover, common in such texts (Note, A ii 12).

As to the immediate origins of the peculiar form of the Tammuz-Adonis myth in our text—e. g. why Anat?—I refer to the caution insisted upon by Baudissin, p. 369 ff., in view of the original parallelism and easy syncretism of Sumerian, Semitic, Anatolian, and I may add, Mediterranean rites.

The rival goddess Asherat is more of a personage than Anat. It is assumed that she is enemy of Anat and Aleyan on the basis of her "rejoicing" over their trouble, A i 11; indeed she is Mot's mother (see above). But she does not continue the rôle of antagonist, and in B is actively engaged in furthering a temple for Aleyan. Her constant title is רבת אתרת, "Lady Asherat". She is רבת אלם "Lady of the gods", and also קנית אלם, "Mistress of the gods", where בעלת might have been used; see Note B i 23. She is mother of "70 Elim", for which large number there are parallels in the Bible and Old-Aramaic (Note, B vi 46). This large family is emphasized in A i 3, "Asherat and her sons, the Goddess and her . . . (אריה ?)".

But her most peculiar designation is "Asherat Lady of the Sea" (אתרת רבת ים), A i 16+. This title has not been explained, except by reference to the mythological sea. To my mind

there arose the name of the Cyprian Aphrodite, "she of the sea-foam" by popular etymology, known to Hesiod of the seventh century with his adjective ἀφρογένης. Etymologists disdain such folk-etymology. But I have discovered that lovely Aphrodite was goddess of the sea. I cite simply from Farnell, *Cults,* ii, 636:

"Her connexion with the sea and her interest in navigation are attested by a long line of titles. Harbours and rocky promontories were named from her or gave her names. At Troezen she was worshipped as 'the watcher from the sea-cliffs'; in the Peiraeeus, at Cnidus, Mylasa, and Naucratis, as the goddess who gave the fair wind; she appears as the saviour from shipwreck in the story told by Athenaeus. . . . At Panticapaeum, as the ruler of ships, she was worshipped by the side of Poseidon the Saviour; and her title Hegemone or 'leader' may have alluded primarily to this function of hers, and may have arisen from the practice which the Greeks may have derived from Phoenicia of carrying her image on board." Etc., etc. Again, p. 641: "As the divinity of a class that wandered far over the Mediterranean Sea she would naturally become regarded as mistress of the sea in this as in many other of her cults. We have a proof of this on a coin of Leucas of the second century B. C., that shows us a figure of Aphrodite, derived probably from a public statue, with an 'aplustre' among her emblems and a ship's prow upon the reverse." And a charming epigram recording her equal powers in love and on the sea is cited by Farnell, p. 690.[10]

But there is also historical legend to give connections between the Cyprian goddess of the sea and the cults in and about Ugarit. It comes again from Sanchuniathon (37b): "At this time the descendants of the Dioscuri [reft. to 36a] having built rafts and ships sailed off; and being cast on the shore near Mount Casius they built a temple there." It can be left to others for speculation, or rather to future discovery, how far Aphrodite became identified with the native Lady Asherat. We may assume that the latter assumed some of the former's characteristics for the sake of her Phoenician sailors who went shipping on the Great Sea; or, without pushing syncretism too far, we may think of parallel developments of similar deities, the one goddess of love, her Syrian sister

[10] In the same terms Nilsson, *The Minoan-Mycenaean Religion,* 341. He supposes, p. 338, that the title of the Cyprian goddess was "Lady".

goddess of fertility. This connection with the sea is further witnessed to by the parallel expressions, "the sea of El, the mount of El" (Note, B ii 35 f.); and if we may accept Vir.'s translation of עמי ים (fragment variant to B vii 55) as "peoples of the sea", we have another reference to Mediterranean connections. In addition in Tablet 2, as Hrozny has noted, there are the names of the peoples of Alasia-Cyprus and Yaman-Ionia.

Of these goddesses I have left to the end the apparently enigmatic נרת אל שפש צחררת I translate: "The Flame of El, Burning Sun". For argument concerning Špš and the adjective see Note to A ii 24. From the beginning I have held that Špš = Heb. Šemeš, "Sun". In this title we have the burning aspect of the sun, which is treated as its feminine mode. We may compare our deity with Nergal. Says Jastrow (*Rel. Bab. u. Ass.*, i, 65): "als die glühende Flamme ist Nergal augenscheinlich eine Erscheinungsform der Sonne."[11] As the Ardent Sun she should be hostile to Anat's cause, for it is the sun which killed Adonis as the spirit of vegetation. But Anat is sent by El to counsel with her, and the latter favors her suit, denouncing the power of Mot and promising to go and seek the lost one, A iii-iv.

Of the minor deities appearing in the texts two are well known, Ḳadesh and Amurru, the two together at B iv 8, otherwise separately.[12]

A pair of subordinate deities appears in the discussion over the architectural details of Aleyan's temple in B vi, vii. Their names are Kṯr and Ḫss; they are treated as a composite deity, with pronouns in the sing., although connected with "and". I soon came to identify Ḫss with the Bab. Ḫasīs, genius of personified Intelli-

[11] Our pronunciation Nergal comes through the Heb. tradition, 2 Ki. 17: 30; the first syllable = "light"; נרת may be vocalized similarly, but preferably nūrat, "flame". There may be popular yet appropriate West-Semitic interpretation of the Babylonian Ner-unu-gal's character. In the Tablets we have the deified פגר שפש, צבה שפש, "Dawn of Sun". Note the series of sun-deities invoked in the Sudshin Aram. inscr. (Bauer, *AfO*, 1932, 1 ff.): Nergal, Lṣ (?), Shemesh, Nūr (so Cantineau would vocalize the last); and in Tab. 17, 8 נר is listed after ים "day". Nergal also appears in an Amarna letter from Alasia-Cyprus, Knudtzon, 35: 13, 37.

[12] See *KAT*[3] 433; Clay, *Amurru*, 95 ff.; Jastrow, *Rel. Bab. u. Ass.*, ii, 39 f. and Index (as from Westland); Vir., xiii, 155. For Ḳadesh in Egypt see Müller, *As. u. Eur.*, 314; he remarks that Egyptian always represents קרש not the fem. קרשה, as we expect from the Bible.

gence connected with a certain goddess of Sumerian name (cf. (Delitzsch, *Ass. Hwb.*); Ḫasīs is also a name of Nabu (Deimel, *Pantheon*, 135). Now Sanchuniathon lists a number of such deified personifications, e. g. (36a) Μισωρ and Συδυκ, Equity and Righteousness, for which compare Akk. Kittu and Mēšāru; also there is Τεχνίτης, Artist.[13] Accordingly I surmised that kṯr, understood as a spelling variant for kšr (see under (I)) represents a noun of that root involving the sense of fittedness, handiness. Kuṯr(?) then is Handiness, properly paired with Intelligence. Further I think that that personage may be identified in the Phoenician legend of Sanchuniathon (35c), namely with the figure of Χυσωρ, who "practised words and charms and divinations", and who was Hephaestus and invented fishing tackle and boats and was the first to sail ships. Of the same race was Technites, already referred to, and also others who "mixed stubble with the clay and dried bricks and invented tiles"; which legend may tie up with the interest of our genii in the building of Aleyan's temple.[14]

There should also be noticed the pair of city deities גפן and אגר (B vii 54, so to be filled out at viii 47). Vir. recognizes in the latter — Ugar? — the deity of Ugarit; the city's name is then derived from the god's, in the form of the adj. rel. fem. in -īt. Vir. failed to see that in the first of the pair we have Gupn, i. e. Byblos. The close relation of the two sea-ports is thus definitely established. These deities are then early examples of the city Tychae which play so large a part in later Syrian religion. We find this feature represented in Ezekiel's prophecies against Tyre, cc. 26-28, in which by the "Prince of Tyre" and the "King of Tyre" (i. e. Melkarth) the Tyche of the city is meant; cf. "prince" used of the tutelary angels in Daniel. I note, supplementarily, that Ba'al-Gupn appears in Tab. 1: 10.

Some interesting features of the cult are presented in the texts. The architectural discussion in B vi, vii apparently concerns the

[13] Cf. Clermont-Ganneau, *Recueil*, v, 206. This mythological scheme is not necessarily of Akk. origin; cf. the Biblical poetic adaptation of such entities, e. g. Ps. 83: 11: "Mercy and Truth have met together, Righteousness and Peace have kissed each other."

[14] I adopt the reading χυσωρ with two MSS *vs.* Gifford's preference for χρυσωρ with one MS. The spelling may represent Heb. כֹּשֶׁר with meaning of כֶּשֶׁרוֹן in Eccl. 2: 21. We may also compare the unique כּוֹשָׁרוֹת Ps. 68: 7.

innovation of lighting the temple as against the older dark adytum. In B vi is given the liturgy of sacrifice for a seven-day period, our earliest notice then of the week in the Westland. Of most interest is the description of an eight-day feast with its climax in a *ἱερὸς γάμος*; for the discussion of which I refer to Note B vi 47 ff. The passage presents the earliest liturgy we possess for that antique rite.

The parallelisms with the Hebrew Bible are very notable; some of them are noticed above, more will be cited below. Most remarkable of all the correspondences is that between Is. 57:8 and B vi 47 ff., which mutually explain one another.

IV. Notes.

A i

5 f. מבך not ppl.; מ' נהרם is to be interpreted from parallel קרב אפק תהמתם, i. e. מ' < rt. נבך, with omission of prep. before labial (Driver, *Text of Sam.*, 37, n. 2) = "the source"; fully paralleled by Job 38:16:

הבאת עד נבכי ים ובחקר תהום התהלכת

N. b. Hierapolis in N. Syria with its old name in the variant forms Bambyke, Mambuj, Mabbuj. For the passage, cf. also Gen. 7:11, and Enoch 60:7, "abysses of the ocean and sources of the waters".—קרב = "near", rather than "in", for which elsewhere several preps.

8. מלך שנם: In addition to the often cited "Ancient of Days" of Dan., cf. אבי עד "Father of eternity", Is. 9:5; the ancient deity אל עולם Gen. 21:23; Ps. 102:25. "for generations and generations are thy years". Cf. B iv 41 עם עלם of El; the prep. as at Ps. 72:5, Dan. 3:33. In general compare the *κρόνος ἀγήραος* of Damascius, *De prin.* § 205, ed. Ruelle, ii, p. 318, tr. Chaignet, ii, 346; as cited from Hieronymos (3d century B. C.) or Hellanikos (5th century), "unless they are identical", says Damascius. For Kronos and his place in Phoen. theology, see indexes of the two editions named. For the assimilation of Kronos with *χρόνος*, see Pauly-Wissowa, 2481.

9. תהבר (+) < theme *br*, *brr*, in secondary formation, *hbr*; *brr* of ritual cleansing, subsequently of piety in Arabic. The impv. הבר at B viii 27.

11. תשא גה (+): Trr., "lift up voice", but without etymology.

I think of Arab. *wajh*, "face" (which Perles proposes to find in נהה Prov. 17:22 (*JQR* 1911, 102); for "lift the face" of frank approach, cf. 1 Sam. 2:22.

11. תשמח[הת]: Vir. = "את(?)"; Albr. reads הם, "them". But cf. כברהות B viii 29, and n. b. הות A iv 35, B iii 36. It may be a pronom. element.

14. חלק "perish", Eth. as well as Akk.

17. שרם = Heb. שדה, cf. A ii 34, not Akk. "mountains".

18. אחד ב בנך : ב = מן; cf. A ii 18 [נשם] בן = מן. Vir., xii, 204, notes that מן never occurs in these texts; yet בשן = משן, B i 20. For similar process in Phoen. see Lidzbarski, *NSE* 312; for many exx. of confusion of *b* and *m* in Heb. see Delitzsch, *Laut- und Schreibfehler im A. T.*, 114 f.

20. בל = בלת l. 26.—ידע: cf. epithet of Aṯtar ערף l. 26. Are these words expressive of second-sight, etc.? Cf. ידעני and Arab. *ʿarrāf*.

21. אל דפאר: doubtless "god of P'ēd", cf. Bauer, p. 70. Other exx. of this rel.-demonstr., with דת as fem., at B i 37, 40, B iv 5 f., etc. For its occurrence in Heb. see my note on "'These twenty years'", *JBL* 1924, 227. As rel. pron. it appears in B i 44 +.

28. פניך = אפנך, with prosthetic א ? For cases in Phoen., see Lidz., *NSE* 389, and n. b. Eshmun.

29. צררת much discussed as related to ṣur, "rock"; but = Arab. *ṣirār*, "high land".

A ii

4 ff. The mutilated introduction to be filled up from the parallel ll. 26 ff.: ים ימם יעתקן לימם תנגשה וג': "while days continue [עתק as at Job 21:7, cf. Akk. *etēḳu*], for days and months the affection of Anat overcomes her, like the heart of the wild-cow [the pl. ארחת at B vi 30] for her calf, like the heart of the ewe for her lamb, so the heart of Anat." I take תנגשה as from נגש, "drive, rule", the object being reflexive (the vb. also at ii 21). I understand ים as "day", used conjunctively, cf. similar use of Arab. *yauma*. I had correctly diagnosed the meaning of the passage with כלב "like the heart" (not "dog"—a good example of the difficulty one misunderstood word makes), Baneth having the credit of its first publication.

9 ff. Tr., "she takes hold of Mot b. Elim by the shoe", i. e. in supplication. There follows in l. 11, after two unknown words, בקץ אלל תשא וג', i. e. "at end of lamentation she raises", etc.; אלל as in Arab. use of the rt., preserved in the Heb. interjection אללי Mic. 7 : 1.

9. ענת אחר בעל; cf. זבל בעל iii 3. Cf. names like Zebulun, Izebel, and the god-names in the Elephantine papyri אשמנביתאל, ענתביתאל, חרמביתאל, and the *nn. pr.* there compounded with ביתאל. See also Eissfeldt, *Archiv f. Rel.-wissensch.*, 1930, 1 ff.

12. 'My brother': cf. "brother, sister, bride" in Cant. and reff. for similar terms in the Tammuz ritual given by Meek, *AJSL* 39, 8. The word appears at end of the last lines of B viii, evidently a choric cry; cf. the like forms cited by Baudissin, *Adonis*, 91.

13. מה = māhū.

17. נפש = iii 19. חסרת; rt. Arab. *ḥasara*, "suffer". המלת: rt. Arab. *hamala*, "weep". בן נשם : בן = מן, see at i 18; נשם = "men", cf. אלם ונשם, "gods and men", B vii 51.

23. Cf. B viii 20 for the obscure text here.

24. For Nrt see under (III). שפש is named along with ירח, "moon" in Tab. 5, 11. For unique change of *m* of *Šmš* to *p* cf. the change to semi-vocalic *y*, with final loss in the Biblical names ששבצר and probably שושא and שישי. We may compare the equivalence of Heb. *ramas* and Arab. *rapasa*. In A iv 25, 46 we find the apparent verbal form with ישפש, but in the second case at least this may be interpreted as vocative, *ya-*; n. b. יאלם B iii 9. The adj. צחררת is from the rt. found in Arab., "be burning", used also of sunstroke; the Ṣaḥārā is the burnt-land.

A iii

4 f. See discussion under (II). There are three parallel occurrences:

A iii 4 f.	B ii 10 f.	B iii 30 f.
בחלם לטפן אל דפאר	תעפף-תר אל דפאר	מגנתם תר אל דפאר
בשרת בני בנות	תצפי בני בנות	הם צפתם בני בנות

For the parallelism of rts. מגן, עפף, צפי see at B i 22. The above exhibit demonstrates the equivalence of לטפן and תר אל with בני בנות, and so the parallelism of ב+חלם and ב+שרת. For [ת]שר = Akk. šīru, cf. the very pertinent note by J. Finkel in

ZAW 1932, 310, on "Hebrew Shīr and Sūra". (בשרה also at B ii 5.) For the dreams of Heb. prophets cf. Jer. 23:9 ff.; for dreams in Bab. practice see Jastrow, *Rel. Bab. u. Ass.*, 2, 954 ff. For the enigmatic בני בנות I venture to compare from the mythological family-tree presented by Sanchuniathon (34c) a pair called Γένος and Γενεά, on which Gifford cites Renan, as saying that "they are undoubtedly translations of two Phoen. words derived from the root ילד, 'to beget'"; substitute the rt. בנה and we have the equivalence desired.

16. יצחק : cf. the name of Isaac, "(El) laughs".

18 f. Tr. "I will seat him and settle him, and my soul will rest in my breast." ארת also at B v 67.

A iv

30. תתבע : reflex. of rt. בעה, "seek".

31. אדך (frequent) : "then", cf. Arab. *'iḏḏāk*.

A v

11 ff. A challenge in a series of announcements containing פהת, for which I compare Arab. fawaha, "speak". קלת = "curse"?

A vi

8. שבעת ṣalmh: "his seven z."; n. b. sing. with num. as in Eth. The same obscure word at B ii 29, v 105, vii 52, 54, and always in connection with deities; is it צלם "image"?

14. יתנ: pf. of Phoen. יתן. At l. 10 יתן may be pf. or impf.

16 ff. יתען כגמרם: The vb. is reflexive, "answer one another"; the next vocable, after an Arab. mng. of the rt., may mean "at their coming together" for the combat. I take it that in the repeated pair of names followed by verbs descriptive of the contest, "Mot the mighty, Baal the mighty", the former is the object, the object being repeated in the verb, "Baal the mighty gores him", etc. The two names are distinct, Mot being never elsewhere called Baal. (For מת עז see Bauer, p. 73). The tenses may well be not historical, but futuritive or precative.

21 f. Possibly: "Mot spoke, Baal spoke." The following עלן is obscure; it appears in connection with אל, B i 38.

23. שמעמע: intensified impv. of שמע, corroborated by B vi 4.

24. אך = "how (canst thou fight, תמתחץ, with Aleyan)?" See at ii 21.

26. ישמעך: a jussive with suffix without parengogic Nun, and so the foll. vbs.

27 ff. ליסע and foll. vbs. probably passives.

30 ff. בן אַלמת = בן אַלם מת, as Bauer notes. ירד is used of Mot's "coming down" to the field of combat; cf. Jud. 5:14, I Sam. 17:28. For ירד see under (III). For יער I propose rt. עור, "rise", Hif. "stir up, challenge", cf. mythological use of the vb. in Job. 3:8, also similar use in Is. 42:13, Ps. 80:3. Cf. תערך B iv 38 f., יערם B vii 7, 36. I would then read, fragmentarily: "Yedud challenges Mot with his voice . . . . . Baal will seat me . . . . (in) his kingdom . . . . for its length . . . years".

B i

4 ff. Fill out fragmentary lines 4-12 from iv 47 ff., and read: "Ṯor-El cries to his father El-Melek that he should establish him [דיכננה—i. e. Aleyan]; he cries to Asherat and her sons, the Goddess and the company of her —: 'And now there is no house for Baal like the gods' houses [= Götterhäuser, cf. Am. 2:8], nor sanctuary like those of Asherat's sons: the dwelling of El,'" etc. Vir. takes as subj. of the second vb. יצח, "cries", "Asherat and her sons", i. e. as pl. vb., but we expect fem. sing. תצח, and so I regard Ṯor-El as subj. of both vbs. I take ון = וְנָה, "and pray"; also at iv 50; cf. ונאף iv 68, "and now also". חפר, parallel to בת, מהב, may be explained from Arab. ḥufrah, "hole", then as crypt, sanctuary; cf. Heb. מעון, סכה, with same development. The several sanctuaries are named: the dwelling (מהב, cf. Ps. 132:13, SArab. *mṯb*) of El; the *mpll* of his sons—i. e. prayer-place, rt. פלל; the dwelling of Lady-Asherat-of-the Sea. There follow obscure names of deities and temples. In Klt Knyt the first word may mean "Bride", the second the name of her temple. The deity Pdry Hrozny would trace to Anatolia; his temple's name באר, so spelt here, is probably correctly given as בתאר iv 55. Arṣy here is Arṣ at iv 57; cf. Γῆ in Sanchuniathon, 36b.

20. משן רגמם: "with two words"; for the prep. see at A i 18.

22 f. For the parallelism מצפ קנית אלם ‖ מגן רבת אתרת ים cf. the foll. parallels:

B iii 25 (Anat precedes)	B iii 28 (Asherat speaks)	B iii 33 (Anat speaks)
תמגן ר' אתרת ים	אד תמגן ר' אתרת ים	נמגננם ר' אתרת ים
תצפין קנית אלם	מגנתם תר אל דפאד	[נצ?]ף קנית אלם
	הם צפתם בני בנות	

Also note the parallelism given in Note, A iii 4 f. The two goddesses appear to be mutually indulging—in dispute?—in certain identical expressions. The three obscure verbal rts. appearing above are evidently parallel in meaning. In the present text מגן ‖ מצח appear to be nominal-participial forms, the former Hif. ppl.?

23. קנית = Canaanite *ba'alat*, not "créatrice" with Vir. In Gen. 14:19 קנה has sense of "master", vs. common trr., "creator". The epithet occurs again at iv 23. Cf. the expression for Asherat as "Lady of the gods", v 65.

28 f. Parallelism of אלפם and רבבת compels me to translate "thousands", "myriads".

30 ff. Mr. Harris notes the parallelism of בת אל, כחה אל, הרם אל (correct אר), נעל אל, תלחן אל.

B ii

12 ff. ענה ותפהן הלך בעל אתרת כתען הלך בתלת ענת: Vir.'s tr. I regard as impossible; *inter al.* he takes "Baal son of Asherat" (*sic*) as Mot, who is never given the title Baal. To keep the grammar I propose to translate: "Answer her and say to her [for the vb. see at A v 11 ff.]: 'Gone is Baal, O Goddess'; yea (כ = Heb. כי) thou shalt answer, 'He is gone, O Virgin Anat'". (Cf. perhaps Ju. 5:29.) The unique אתתרת is a problem. Vir. thinks of misspelling for אתרת, after a similar confusion in the Amarna letters. I suggest that it is reduced *via* Akk. pronunciation (?) from עתתרת, and is used in the general sense of "goddess", as in Jud. 10:6, etc., "the Baals and Goddesses".

21 ff. We would naturally translate אך "where", but in the enlarged parallel passage iv 31 ff. it must have the interjectional sense "how": "How has gone Baal, how has gone V. Anat!" N. b. the stative form *maẓiyat*.

24 f. Read ארי ברת [אתרת (?) וצ]בנית בנה אתתי אמ[ת]חץ: "I will verily fight her sons, Asherat and the company of her —." מחצי is an abs. inf.; other cases iv 33, 34, possibly iv 41; or it may be more exactly compared to the Eth. gerund, i. e. *meḫīṣéya*.

35 f. בים אל ד[---כ]הר אל: Vir. inserts פאר, which is never connected with El. For the mount of El cf. the utterance against the Prince of Tyre, Eze. 28:14, 16 אל [בהר[קדש]; and for the sea of God the parallel in the same oracle put in the mouth of the Prince, v. 2: "I sit in the sea of God, in the heart of the seas".

B iii

9. Vir. treats יאלם as a vb.,—but with what sense? If י is part of the vocable, this must be a vocative; cf. ישפש A vi 25.

11. יתעדד רכב ערפת: see at v 70 f.

13. פחר בן אלם "the assembly of the deities", not "of the Son of God", with Vir. In addition to Vir.'s comparison of פחר with מפחרת in Dunand's Yeḥi-milk inscr. from Byblos, cf. פחר אלם in Tab. 2, 17, and the equivalent Heb. מועד in הר מועד, Is. 14: 13.

23. אחר: not "après que", but "afterwards", as thrice in O. T.

B iv

5 f. = **10** f. שת גפנם דת כסף דת ירק: I translate: "two platters, (n. b. שת for חת), one of silver, the other of gold". Vir. "vines" is not in place here; I compare Arab. *jufnah*, "plate". For ירק "gold", Arab., Eth. *warḳ*, Vir. notes the phrase he finds elsewhere, *yrḳ ḫrṣ*, and I compare ירקרק חרוץ, Ps. 68: 5.

13. אמרר vs. אמר, l. 8, etc.; is this reminiscent of an Akk. syllabication a-mur-ru?

19. תבע: not with Vir., "poursuit", rt. תבע, but rt. בעה, "shalt seek", as at A iv 30; cf. Is. 21: 12.

19. מרים צפן = v 85, prob. so to be filled out in vii 11, 12: "the Exalted One of the North"; מ' = Heb. עליון. Měraiyĕmā is a common name for God in the Syr. Bible, the standing name for him in the Odes of Solomon (see my *Dan.*, 225). The same verbal form occurs in SArab. Cf. Sanchuniathon, 344: *ἐγεννήθη Σαμηροῦμος ὁ καὶ Ὑψουράνιος*; so with earlier editors, Gifford preferring (see his note) *ἐγεννήθησαν Μημροῦμος καὶ ὁ Ὑψ. Μημρουμος* apparently = מרום, the same noun being used of heaven, e. g. in Mic. 6: 6, "the God of heaven". The former reading, however, is preferable, = שמי מרום, corresponding with Bibl. שמי שמים.

33 f. עמא צמאת || רצב רצבת: evidently a parallelism of contrasted ideas; ר' = Arab. *raṭaba*, Heb. רטב (Job), "be wet"; צ' = Arab. *ẓamiʾa* "be thirsty", the same rts. in Akk. (cf. "the cups of wine', l. 37). The first word in each pair is abs. inf.; cf. ii 24 f.

38 f. אהבת תר תערך || יד אלמלך יחסך: as "hand" is impossible with masc. vb., יד = Arab. *wadd*, "love", appearing in monosyllabic form in the Heb. n. pr. יְדִי, var. יַדַּי (caritative for

Yadd-yahu, as ישי for Yeš-yahu; Noth does not include this name under derivatives from rt. ידד, *Personennamen,* 149). Vocalize the parallel noun as אַהֲבַת. Rt. *ḥss,* if connected with the genius with similar name (see under (III)), may mean "think upon", or possibly as causative, "make intelligent". For rt. ערר, or עור, "arouse", see at A vi 30 ff. N. b. the jussive forms, as at A vi 26.

41 ff. Vir.: "the wise God attributes to thee wisdom" (for the vb. תחם see at A iv 37). But the parallelism with l. 43, תחמך מלכן וג׳, "x-thee our king Aleyan", etc., requires here an epithet of El; accordingly חכם חכמת is an intensive phrase, "wise-of-wisdom", i. e. "wisest" (cf. Eitan, *La répétition de la racine en hébreu, JPOS* 1, 171). The noun recurs at l. 65. For עם עלם see at A i 8.

47 ff. See at i 4 ff.

59 f. עבר apparently with both forms of the pers. pron. Is פ identical with Arab. fa-, — "should I, then I would", with ppls.?

B v

65 f. Vocalize לְחָכְמַת שְׂבַת דְּקָנֵךְ: "by the wisdom of the grey hairs of thy beard". Such adjurations, I believe, are common with the Arabs; cf. Doughty, *Arabia Deserta,* 268.

70 ff. ותן קלה בערפת שרה לארץ ברקם וג׳: Vir., "il donne sa voix dans les nuages, son sr pour la terre (ce sont) les éclaires. Une maison [properly reading בת for אֵת] de cèdres il achèvra pour lui". The collation of קל, ערפת = Akk. *urpāti,* Heb. ערפל, and ברקם, also מטרה l. 68, appears to be strong argument for finding here meteorological phenomena; is Deity speaking out of the storm commanding the building of the temple (cf. Dt. 5:19, etc.)? Also there is the correspondence at iii 11, 18, which Vir. translates "who rides the clouds" (cf. also his observations, xii, 196). Even so, sense is not obtained for the reading of our passage. I note that here we expect a parallelism between ב+ערפת and ב+רקם. Further both here and at iii, 11, 18 we are concerned with temples and their rites. In the latter passage I had understood יתערד רכב ערפת as "let there be prepared the furnishing of a temple-hall". I. e., ערד as in Arab. rt. IV; רכב in the original sense of the rt., "to fix together, articulate", surviving in the intensives of the Arab. and Syr. vbs.; ערפת as the architectural term found in the Yeḥaw-Milk inscr. of Byblos, understood as a

pillared hall or the like, cf. Arab. *ǵurafah*; see Cooke, *NSI* 23. While the text is by no means cleared up by this criticism, at least we relate it to the context. A parallel appears in Ezekiel's utterance against Tyre, 27:4: "Thy builders have perfected (כללו) thy beauty . . . . . cypress trees . . . . cedars . . . "

75. חרן poss. an epithet of Aleyan, also ll. 91, 98; then poss. = Heb. *ḥōr*, "noble", with the common primitive name-suffix *-ān*; cf. the place-name Beth-Horon.— בבהמך error, as Vir. recognizes, for בבהתך, as at ll. 81, 92. The word is evidently related to בית; Bauer regards the ה as *mater lect.*, as in מהרבא in Mesha inscr.; to which I add "Abraham". Cf. the related Arab. *bahw*, "tent, house".

77 ff. תבלך, יבלך = passives plus dative.— צרם || כסף, חרץ, i. e. a metal; cf. Arab. *ẓarama*, "burn", Akk. *ṣarāpu*, "fused metal", and *ṣarpu*, a word for silver.— גבעם: Vir. "cups", which elsewhere is *krpnm*; I suggest "heaps", cf. A ii 16, || to מאד.— מחמד is the Heb. "precious things.— אדר = "glory"; the related adj. is epithet of Phoen. deities.— אלקצם = "to their extreme", as in the use of Heb. קצה. I translate accordingly: "Be brought to thee *ẓrm* in quantity, silver in heaps, precious-things of gold, be brought to thee glory, to their utmost".

104 f. In this obscure panel I would read ספר, "written message", in connection with תלאכן, rt. "send", rather than מספר, "count".

110. ער לחם שתי: Cf. vi 55, ער לחם שתי אלם, i. e. "in addition to the meat, the drink of the divinities"; cf. Bibl. לחם אלהים.

113-116. The repeated חש (Vir. "hasten") may be the ritual הס, "silence!", e. g. Hab. 2:20.

118. Read באלף with l. 85.

B vi

3. חן רגם: Vir. as impv.; better in the parallelism; "K.-and-H. repeated the word".

11. בת רב: certainly "great house" (temple, i. e., *ekallu*), as at A i 18.

23. נפלאת, repeated in parallelism with אשת, "fire-offering", in foll. lines. Vir. cft. Bibl. נפלאות, "wonders". But rt. פלא Piel has mng., "make a particular (supererogatory) sacrifice", Lev. 27:2, and our word is to be so understood. For the phonetic changes, *mp* > *mb* > *nb* cf. my paper on "The nominal prefix *n*",

JAOS 1923, 50. Evidently the Heb. noun for "wonders" proceeds from מפ'.

32. Mr. Harris cleverly suggests filling out שב- to שבע. i. e. "the seventh day". Lines 24 ff. then present a daily order for a week of ritual celebration—our earliest reference to this religious period in the Hebrew region. See at ll. 46 ff.

42. תרם = "bulls". The preceding צאן שקל, "sheep of —", is parallel to the following אמר קמץ "lambs of —".

46. "The seventy sons of Asherat": i. e. the number typical of a distinguished family; cf. "the 70 'cousins' (איחי) of my father's house" in Panammu inscr., 3; the 70 sons of Gideon, Jud. 9:15; the 70 sons of Ahab, 2 Ki. 10:16; also the traditional "70 souls' of Jacob's family, Ex. 1:5.

47-54. These eight lines end with a vocable beginning with *y*, the second letter being almost always obliterated at the broken margin. At l. 53 Vir. writes and reads *yn*, "wine"; with this he makes no sense in his translation. In l. 51 *ym*, "day", is more certainly to be read; with this we obtain a ritual for an eight-day period. If this understanding be correct, we may compare the Succoth liturgy for a feast of an octave in Num. 29:12 ff. Fortunately the balance of the lines is entirely clear as to syntax, and all the words are intelligible or their meaning can be approximated. Each line begins with שפק, followed with accusatives of the deities and the sacrifices; I suggest that it is Shaphel of פוק, = "bring forth, give", as at Is. 58:10. We may then read:

47. Present to the gods lambs, a day (?).
48. Present to the goddesses she-lambs (?), a day.
49. Present to the gods oxen, a day.
50. Present to the goddesses wild-cows, a day.
51. Present to the gods seats, a day.
52. Present to the goddesses thrones, a day.

At l. 58 the word חפרת is unknown, but represents evidently an animal; Professor Speiser cleverly compares Akk. *ḫurāpu* "the young of sheep", which is common in the Nuzi tablets; cf. Landsberger, *AfO* 1926, 164 ff. The god and goddesses are given respectively animals of their own gender, and even the "seats" and "thrones" are respectively masc. and fem. For the former word see A i 30. The ritual is that of the presentation of (empty) thrones for the presence of the gods, a rite that O. T. students

have for long connected with the ark of Yahweh; see H. Schmidt, "Kerubenthron u. Lade", in the Gunkel-*Eucharisterion* volume, 1923, and especially his chapter on "Leere Götterthrone", 132 ff., in which he also gives the pertinent literature for the Hellenic world. I proceed with the remaining lines:

53. Present to the gods רחבת, a day.
54. Present to the goddesses [ד]כרנ[ם] a day.

Here the gift to the gods becomes one of fem. gender, we may assume that that for the goddess is masc. The second word is read by Vir. רכרת, so as fem.; by filling out the single stroke of the alleged *t* to three strokes (in the broken margin) I obtain *n*, and read as pl. masc. + *m*, with the result as above. I have only at the last moment seen light on these two lines. It occurred to me that the two cryptic words appear in a Biblical text denouncing some form of obscene worship, namely Is. 57:8. It reads: "Behind the door and the door-post thou [fem.] hast set up thy זכרון . . . . . [a half-line obscure]; thou hast made broad thy bed [so the usual tr. of הרחבת משכבך]; . . . . . [a half-line obscure]; thou hast loved lying with them, seeing the pillar (יד)". Since the Targum it has been recognized that the last Heb. word stood for an idol figure, and for long it has been understood as a word for the phallus. More recently, at least since Franz Delitzsch's Commentary, and established more positively by Duhm, whom subsequent commentators follow, זכרון is interpreted in the same way, as the "male"-organ. It is the very word we have above in l. 54; the goddesses are presented with these lustful symbols. The gift to the gods, רחבת, must then represent the female organ, an aphrodisiac symbol for the gods. Thus at once light is cast upon the Isaianic passage; the phrase הרחבת משכבך must have a technical meaning. And now we understand the meaning of the Biblical passage; it is a denunciation of the ἱερὸς γάμος of some goddess, to whom the feminine gender of the verbs and pronouns refer. For these rites I can only briefly refer to the extensive literature on the subject. Zimmern postulates such divine nuptials for the Babylonian religion, *Das bab. Neujahrsfest*, 16. For the Hellenic field I am indebted to Prof. R. K. Yerkes for the following references: J. E. Harrison, *Prolegomena*[3], 534 ff., 548 ff.; Farnell, *Cults*, see Index under 'Marriage' and especially vol. i, c. 8; Nilsson, *Minoan-Mycenaean* Rel., 479 ff.

55. See at v 110.

B vii

5 f. בצַּרכם: "in your mountain" ‖ to בצפן. For the noun see at viii 2.

11 f. Fill out -מ (*bis*) to מרים as epithet of Baal; see at iv 19.

35. Read אאחֹר "I will take" (Vir. תי).

43. אמלך אֹב למלך: "I will make אֹב king"; the word is epithet of Aleyan, as at l. 35 אֹב בעל, l. 37 אלאִין בעל אֹב (with different Alephs). I suggest אב = אֵב, "blossom", as at Cant. 6:11 = Akk. *inbu*, etc., and take it as proper title of the corn-god. Cf. the very *à propos* section in Baudissin, *Adonis*, 161-166, "Die Deutung des Adonis als die Frucht". He cites many examples of the application to Adonis of the epithet *καρπός*.

49 ff. בגננה; I suggest from גן by reduplication, "in his garden" (Vir., "in his tomb"). For the Adonis gardens see Frazer, *Adonis*, i, c. 9; Baudissin, *Adonis*, 130 ff. Cf. possibly Eze. 28:17. Then read: "I rejoice that he will reign over gods, let him rule over gods and men"; ימרא, "rule" from the rt. in Aram. *mārē'* and Arab. *imru'*, "man".

B viii

1 ff. צַּר = צור "Rock" (as at vii 5), primitive name for deity in Bible, old Arabic, etc. The following titles, "Rock of Trẓzz". "Rock of Trṁg" are doubtless geographical. May we compare for the former תרז, "Tarsus", and may the accumulation of emphatics be attempts at spelling? Line 4: "with Tlm of Zinzar, the land": the deity's name is obscure; "the land" may be postpositive as in Aramaic; a similar case in l. 8 after an unknown geographical name, which may be read Bīt-Ḫptt.

12 ff. Read: "from the throne of his abode [חה with Vir. as a scribal blunder], the land of his inheritance". Biblical parallels are obvious.

Finished May 1, 1933.

Addenda

In addition to Note to A vi 8 is to be noticed that the numeral with singular noun occurs in the Sudshin inscription, Ab 3, foll.

Some of the remarkable finds at Ras Shamra in the campaign of 1932 are presented by the excavator, M. Schaeffer, in the *Illustrated London News*, Feb. 11, 1933, with 20 illustrations.

A propos to some of the material given above is the learned article by Père Ronzevalle, "Venus lugens et Adonis Byblius", in *Mélanges* of the University St. Joseph, Beyrouth, 15 (1930-31), 139-204.

Add to bibliography at end of Note to B vi 47-54 the essays edited by S. H. Hooke, *Myth and Ritual*, Oxford, 1933; see Index under 'Marriage, sacred'.

Add to Note to B vii 49 ff. The גגן can at last be explained from Sidney Smith's discussion of *gigunu* in his "Assyriological Notes", *JRAS* 1928, 884 ff. He demonstrates that the word indicates the bridal chamber at top of ziggurats, such as was first described by Herodotus. Our word is obtained from it by nasal dissimilation. Vir. is accordingly correct in his etymology and Smith supplies the meaning. We thus obtain another reference to the ἱερὸς γάμος discussed in a preceding Note. For the first נ Speiser compares יסנגל, CT 4, 39c = Esagila.

KṢEMENDRA AS *kavi*

M. B. EMENEAU
YALE UNIVERSITY

SEVERAL studies have been made of Kṣemendra's Bṛhatkathāmañjarī and the qualities and defects of that work have been enumerated and to some extent illustrated. Bühler in his article "On the Vṛihatkathá of Kshemendra," *Indian Antiquary*, I (1872), pp. 302-309, remarked: "His style is not so flowing as Somadeva's and in his excessive eagerness for brevity, he sometimes becomes obscure." M. Sylvain Lévi's brilliant monograph, "La Bṛihatkathāmañjarī de Kshemendra," remarks: "S'agit-il de raconter? Kshemendra resserre, résume, élague et substitue à un original vivant, mouvementé, dramatique, une narration sèche et laconique. S'offre-t-il un prétexte à tourner quelques vers descriptifs? Kshemendra s'empresse d'en profiter sans aucun souci des proportions générales."[1] The reason advanced for this procedure, and undoubtedly the correct reason, is that Kṣemendra was a novice in the art of composition at the period when he made this compilation. Later in his literary career, in his *Kavikaṇṭhābharaṇa*,[2] Kṣemendra recommended to young poets that they should rework poems which have already had success. This practice he was following when he composed his Bṛhatkathāmañjarī. In consequence he was less concerned than he might have been with producing a smoothly-flowing narrative, but inserted florid descriptions and other specimens of *kāvya* verse which might give him an opportunity both of showing and of consolidating his skill in handling the tools of a *kavi*. Lévi in his article edited the first *lambhaka* of the work and also the introduction and the first two stories of the Vetālapañcaviṅśati as it is presented in the Bṛhatkathāmañjarī. These portions of the text show clearly enough the excessive use of unseasonable ornament of which western scholars complain. Speyer in his "Studies about the Kathāsaritsāgara,"[3] since he was able to use the text published by Śivadatta and Parab

[1] The monograph is in *JA* 1885, ii, pp. 397-479; and 1886, i, pp. 178-222. This quotation is on p. 419 of the first instalment.

[2] Schönberg, *SWA* 1884, p. 484.

[3] *Verhandelingen d. K. Ak. v. Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Afd. Lett., N. R.*, viii. 5.

(Kāvyāmālā 60), contributed a further short list of *kāvya* digressions in the work.

It has been universally recognised that both Kṣemendra and Somadeva were abridging a previous work, now lost, the Bṛhatkathā, and that they worked independently of each other. Lacôte, Hertel, and Edgerton have further made it probable that the original Bṛhatkathā did not contain the Pañcatantra or the Vetālapañcaviṅśati, but that a later reworking of this original, made possibly in Kashmir, inserted both collections. Whatever the exact facts were, both Kṣemendra and Somadeva contain both collections. The Pañcatantra is notably abbreviated in both versions. It is shorn of its introduction, of several stories, and of most of its moralising matter. Somadeva's version, however, loses nothing in the narrative itself. Kṣemendra, on the other hand, cuts down even this to such an extent that the result is hardly intelligible. Statistics may offer a partial demonstration of this; for the actual text, L. von Mańkowski's *Der Auszug aus dem Pañcatantra in Kshemendras Bṛihatkathâmañjarî* may be referred to. Speyer[4] estimates that the Bṛhatkathāmañjarī contains in all 7561 *ślokas*, the Kathāsaritsāgara 21388; i. e. the former is a little more than a third of the latter. But this proportion does not hold for every section of the works. In some sections Kṣemendra is notably shorter than this proportion would lead us to expect, in others he is longer. This latter state of affairs is true for both the special collections. Somadeva's Pañcatantra consists of 539 *ślokas*; Kṣemendra's in Mańkowski's edition has 306, but, since several stories are included which are not found in Somadeva and which should be deducted before a proportion is worked out, the total may be reduced to about 270. The proportion then is almost exactly one to two. The figures for the Vetālapañcaviṅśati are as follows: Somadeva 2195, Kṣemendra 1206 (this figure is based not on the edition but on a text compiled by myself from MS. material). The proportion is .55 + .

In spite of the fact that the proportions for the two special collections are practically identical, the results as seen in the texts are startlingly different. Kṣemendra's Pañcatantra is almost unintelligible and is totally without ornament; his Vetālapañcaviṅśati is intelligible enough, though rather more concise, as compared

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 14-16.

with Somadeva's, while he uses ornament to a much greater extent than Somadeva. The conclusion may be drawn that the Pañcatantra is notably abbreviated in both versions, and that the Bṛhatkathā in which it was included also contained it in an abbreviated form, which Kṣemendra could not with the best will cut to much less than half. It seems a legitimate conclusion also that this Bṛhatkathā contained the Vetālapañcaviṅśati in a full and complete form, and that Somadeva found it attractive enough to give without much abbreviation. Kṣemendra also seized upon it, as he did not upon the Pañcatantra, as a suitable outline which he might clothe in the glowing colors of ornament. That he might have abbreviated it much more than he did may be seen from a further set of statistics. Uhle, in *AKM* VIII, no. 1, pp. 69-92, edited an "anonyme Recension" of the Vetālapañcaviṅśati in prose, which he recognised rightly as an abbreviation of Kṣemendra's version. Page 65 of his edition shows 22 *ślokas* to the page. We may estimate then, very roughly, that the "anonyme Recension" if turned into *ślokas* would amount to between 500 and 600 *ślokas,* i. e. about half the length of Kṣemendra's version. Śivadāsa's version, edited in the same publication, if subjected to the same process, would yield about 1300 *ślokas,* and this edition of Śivadāsa contains some interpolated matter.

It can be demonstrated that some of Kṣemendra's ornament was not recklessly inserted by him, but that the Bṛhatkathā already contained at least the germs of it. This will be done by giving both Kṣemendra's and Somadeva's versions of particular passages and pointing out their agreements where their conceits or their actual words are peculiar enough to be significant. Such agreements show that the Bṛhatkathā version which they both used also contained either these features or something very close to them. All the passages are drawn from the Vetālapañcaviṅśati; the text given for Kṣemendra sometimes differs from that of the edition since it is based upon MS. material.[5]

[5] The *editio princeps* of Śivadatta and Parab is very faulty. Their MS. material is and probably will remain unknown. In footnotes they give variant readings which they designate as those of *ka* and *kha*. (When I have occasion to quote these readings, I use K and Kh.) What these sigilla denote is uncertain. In some sections of the edition both are used on the same page; to give an example taken at random, p. 128 gives six *kha*-readings and one *ka*. But such pages are rare; in general *kha* is used

The introductory story of the collection contains the famous description of the cemetery. This has been published already by Lévi,[6] as well as in the *editio princeps;* however, my MSS. yield

throughout a long section, then *ka* in another long section. This is true of the Vetālapañcaviṅśati which is contained in 9. 2. 19-1221 (pp. 289-385). The variants are marked *ka* through p. 341, vs. 675; on p. 342 there are four *kha*'s and one *ka*; from there to p. 385 *kha*, except on p. 367 which has two *kha*'s and one *ka*. This state of affairs seems to denote two MSS. used on no known critical principle. But the University of Pennsylvania has a MS. of the Bṛhatkathāmañjarī which ends with the Vetālapañcaviṅśati and of which I had the use in collating this portion (I denote its readings by P). It has a commentary in Nepali; date uncertain, perhaps 150 years old. Curiously enough, for the Vetālapañcaviṅśati, it varies from the edition in that, among other differences, its readings are almost invariably those of the editors' footnotes, whether marked by them with *ka* or with *kha*. It is possible that the editors used one MS. in the text and gave the variant readings of one other in the footnotes, using both sigilla to denote the latter. Many of P's readings, however, are mere scribal errors or corruptions.

I have also used India Office Library, Burnell MS. 447, which I denote as G. This is a copy of Tanjore Palace MS. 4880.

Four other MSS. were copied in India for Professor Edgerton of Yale University in 1914. These copies he has kindly put at my disposal. Three of these are copies of Tanjore Palace MSS. Only one of them is marked with the Library number, viz. no. 10218, which I denote by T. The other two, R and S, seem to correspond in the amount of material that they contain with nos. 10219 and 10220, but I am unable to determine which is which. R, S, and T are practically identical with one another in their readings, and may be regarded as one MS. for critical purposes.

The fourth copy, which I call Q, unfortunately cannot even be ascribed to any library, as the only bureau-stamp it bears is illegible. It is practically identical with G in its readings; the two, G and Q, may be used critically as one MS.

Although these MSS. should be supplemented by others for a critical edition, they suffice as sources from which to correct the printed text. The groups RST and QG are close to one another, P represents a somewhat different tradition. Where P agrees with either of the two groups I have adopted the reading thus given. Frequently, however, the corruptions in P have thrown me back on RST and QG, and occasionally a sensible reading seems to be given only in one group or in one MS. Emendation, other than mere correction of *saṁdhi*, has been resorted to very sparingly.

I quote the Kathāsaritsāgara from the fourth edition (1930) of Durgāprasād and Parab.

[6] *Ibid.*, first instalment, pp. 194-195. I need hardly say how much I am indebted to Lévi's translation for the interpretation of this difficult passage.

a version differing somewhat from both, and this purple patch may be given here in full. BKM 9. 2. 40-58a (I number the *ślokas* in my text separately for each story in the collection, with the result that the numbers for passages from the introductory story and story 1 agree with those in Lévi's publication) :

tataḥ śmaśānaṁ saṁprāpa niḥśaṅko bhūtasaṁkulam
sarvāpāyamayaṁ kāyam ivā "yāsaśatāśrayam 22
mastiṣkaliptaśubhrāsthiprakaraṁ lohitāsavam
ākrīḍam iva kālasya kapālacaṣakākulam 23
dhūmāndhakāramalinaṁ vīrendrārāvagarjitam
cañcaccitāgnitaḍitaṁ kālamegham ivo 'tthitam 24
gṛdhrākṛṣṭāntramālābhiḥ kṛtaprālambavibhramam
kālyā ivo 'tsavonmattakṛttikānṛttakampitam 25
jīrṇāsthinalakacchidrakṣipraśiñjānamārutam
saṁcaradyoginīvṛndanūpurair iva rāvitam 26
dikṣu pratiphaladghorapheravasphārahuṁkṛtam
trijagatpralayārambhakṛtoṁkāram ivā 'ntakam 27
maṇḍitaṁ muṇḍakhaṇḍena kaṅkālakulamālinam
jvalitāṅgāranayanaṁ dvitīyam iva bhairavam 28
pratyagrarudhirāpūrasaṁpūritavṛkodaram
karṇaśalyoddhṛtārāvaṁ duḥśāsanavadhākulam
(saṁcaradbhīmapuruṣaṁ dvitīyam iva bhāratam) 29
bahucchalaṁ dyūtam iva strīcittam iva dāruṇam
avivekam ivā 'nekaśaṅkātaṅkaniketanam 30
kharotkaṭajanasthānaṁ ghoraśūrpaṇakhāvṛtam
daṇḍakāraṇyasadṛśaṁ mārīcarucirāntaram 31
bhrāntākampanadhūmrākṣameghanādavibhīṣaṇam
laṅkādāham ivo 'dbhūtaṁ jīvadrāvaṇaviplavam 32
samagraduḥkhanilayaṁ bhūtasaṁghapraharṣaṇam
bahucchidraṁ ghanāśliṣṭapretarāśinirantaram 33
palāśaśatasaṁbādhaṁ citāniḥśeṣitadrumam
śivābhir vyāptam aśivaṁ bhrāntāntakam anantakam 34
niṣkampakucakumbhābhir vipulaśroṇibhir muhuḥ
digambarābhir nārībhiḥ kalpitoccaṇḍatāṇḍavam 35
gṛdhragomāyugahanaṁ kākakaṅkakulākulam
pramattabhūtavetālalāsyamelakamālitam 36
piśācaḍākinījuṣṭaraṭaḍḍamarumaṇḍalam
spaṣṭāṭṭahāsamaṭakaṁ krīḍaccakreśvarīcayam 37
bhayaṁkaraṁ bhayasyā 'pi mohasyā 'pi vimohanam

tamaso 'py andhatamasaṁ kṛtāntasyā 'pi kṛntanam 38
dṛṣṭvā pitṛvanaṁ ghoraṁ ḍākinīgaṇasevitam
kṣāntiśīlaṁ vaṭatale so 'paśyat kṛtamaṇḍalam [7] 39

"Then fearlessly he entered the cemetery which was full of demons. It was like an assemblage of all deaths, the abode of hundreds of troubles. Full of heaps of white bones smeared with brains, it seemed like Death's pleasure-garden where blood was the drink and skulls were the cups. Dusky with the blackness of smoke, thundering with the cries of men, lightening with the leaping fires of funeral-pyres, it seemed like a cloud of death (or, a black cloud) that had arisen. The likeness of a pendant ornament was formed by garlands of vulture-torn entrails. It seemed to be

---

[7] 22a *saṁprāpa* MSS. Lévi, *sa prāpa* ed. 25a *gṛdhrāk°* QRS, *gṛdhrak°* GPLévi; *kṛtapr°* MSS. Lévi, *kṛtaṁ pr°* ed. b *°kāṇṛtta°* MSS. Lévi, *°kāmṛta°* ed.; *°kampitam* QLévi, *°kampitaḥ* RS. *°kampatim* GPed. 26a *°śiñjāna°* QGRSLévi, *°vijñāna°* ed.; *°chidrasiñjānaghanamārutam* PK. 27a *°kvaṇad°* PK for *°phalad°* QGRSLévi; *°ghora°* MSS. Lévi for *°ghoṣa°* ed.; *°sphārahuṁkārahuṁkṛtam* ed. Lévi, *°pheravasphārajaṁkṛtam* PK, *°pheravasphārahuṁkṛtam* GRS, *°pheravasthāna* xxxx Q. 28a *duṣṭakañkālamālitām* ed., *duṣṭakañkalamālitam* Lévi, *kañkālakulamālinam* GRS, *kañkālākulamālitam* Q, *kapālakulamālinam* P. 29a *°vṛkodaram* MSS. ed., *°mahodaram* KLévi. 29c as found in ed. Lévi is not in RSP (this section is not in T); G has *śikhaṁdiracitabhrāṁtipratyakṣam iva bhāratam*, Q *kauravāyodhanam iva śakunikrūrabhāṣitam*. Four of Uhle's MSS. of Śivadāsa's version have interpolated this description and include 29c, but omit 29a; it should be noticed that both a and c refer to Bhīma. Vs. 32 which refers to the Rāmāyaṇa does not explicitly mention that work. Though six-*pāda* verses are not rare in the Bṛhatkathāmañjarī, yet on the whole the evidence seems to be against 29c. It is possible that it was a gloss introduced into the text in some MSS. 31a *°sarpana°* ed. for *°śūrpaṇa°* MSS. Lévi. b *°rucitā°* ed. Lévi, *°rucirā°* RSPK, *°rudhirā°* G, *°racitā°* Q. 32a *bhrātā°* Ped., *bhrāntā°* GSLévi, *bhrānta°* R; *°bhīṣaṇam* QSPLévi, *°bhūṣaṇam* GRed. 34a *palāśa°* MSS. ed., *palāśi°* Lévi; *citā°* MSS. ed., *cintā°* Lévi. 35a *niṣkampa°* QGLévi, *nikumbha°* Ped., *niṣkumbha°* S. b *°toccaṇḍ°* QGS, *°toddaṇḍ°* Lévi, *°tākāṇḍ°* ed., *°tāṇṛtyakāṇḍavam* P. 36b *°tālalāsyamelāpamālitam* QGRS, *°tālamālāmalakamānikam* P, *°tālavāmāmelakamālitam* Lévi, *°tālaṁ mālāmelakamālitam* ed. 37a *piśācaḍākinījuṣṭāraṭassamarukodbhaṭam* RS, *piśācaḍākinījuṣṭalasadrumaruḍambaram* G, *piśācaḍākinījuṣṭaṁ raṭaḍḍamarumaṇḍalam* Q, *piśācaśākinījuṣṭaṁ laḍaḍḍamarumaṇḍalam* P, *piśācaśākinīyuktaṁ laḍaḍḍamarumaṇḍalam* ed. Lévi. b *°maṭakaṁ* RSP Lévi, *°makaṭaṁ* Qed. 38a *mohasyāpi vimohanam* GP, *mohasyāpi ca mohanam* RS, *vimohasyāpi mohanam* Qed. Lévi. b *kṛntanam* QGRSP, *kampanam* ed. Lévi.

shaken by the drunken dancing of the Kṛttikās at Kālī's festival. The wind swiftly whistled through the holes in long, decayed bones; the place resounded as if with the noise of the anklets of a rushing troop of witches. With the terrible, loud howling of jackals resounding in all directions, it seemed like the Lord of Death when he has spoken the Word Om at the beginning of the destruction of the three worlds. Adorned with fragments of skulls, encircled with many skeletons, with gleaming coals for eyes, it seemed a second Bhairava (Śiva). The bellies of wolves were (or, Bhīma was) filled there with streams of fresh blood; the tumult that was raised caused pain to the ears (or, Karṇa and Śalya raised a tumult); the place was filled with the punishment of uncontrollable men (or, with the murder of Duḥśāsana). [Agitated with terrible beings (or, with Bhīma's men moving about), it was like another Mahābhārata.] It was filled with delusion, like gambling; full of cruelties, like a woman's heart; the abode of much fear and anxiety, like lack of judgment. It was a place of rough and furious beings and was filled with terrible female-demons (or, it was like Janasthāna filled with thorns, the abode of terrible Śūrpaṇakhā); it was like the Daṇḍaka-forest, the retreats of which are dear to the male-demons (or, to Mārīca). It was terrible because of the thunder which caused the agitated and blinded eyes to tremble (or, Akampana, Dhūmrākṣa, Meghanāda, and Vibhīṣaṇa wandered there); distress caused the living to flee (or, to cry; or, it was the ruin of Rāvaṇa while he lived); it was like a visible burning of Laṅkā. It was an abode of all distress, which caused the troops of demons to rejoice; it had many holes, but the multitude of closely-pressed corpses showed no gaps. It was crowded with hundreds of *palāśa*-trees (or, of *rākṣasas*), and in it trees were totally consumed in funeral-pyres. It was full of jackals (*śivā*) and was inauspicious (*aśiva,* which can also mean "without jackals"); death (*antaka*) roamed there and the place was boundless (*anantaka,* which can also mean "without death"). Naked women with firm swelling breasts and huge hips incessantly performed a violent dance (in the worship of Śiva). The place was the resort of vultures and jackals, it was full of flocks of crows and herons. The assemblies of demons and goblins who danced lasciviously there seemed to encircle the place with garlands. There was a circle of crashing drums beloved of the Piśācas and Ḍākinīs; corpses laughed clear and loud; innumerable Cakreśvarīs

sported there. The place caused fear itself to be afraid, confused even confusion, was the black darkness even of darkness, cut off (*kṛntana*) even death (*kṛtānta*). When the king had seen that horrible place of the dead, frequented by troops of Ḍākinīs, he perceived at the foot of the *vaṭa*-tree Kṣāntiśīla who had traced a circle."

KSS 75. 42-44:

yayau ca ghoranibiḍadhvāntavrātamalīmasam
citānalogranayanajvālādāruṇadarśanam 42
asaṁkhyanarakaṅkālakapālāsthiviśaṅkaṭam
hṛṣyatsaṁnihitottālabhūtavetālaveṣṭitam 43
bhairavasyā 'paraṁ rūpam iva gambhīrabhīṣaṇam
sphūrjanmahāśivārāvaṁ śmaśānaṁ tad avihvalaḥ 44

"Fearlessly he went to the cemetery. It was like a second form of Bhairava (Śiva), mysteriously terrible, darkened with a dense and terrible pall of night, its aspect horrible with the frightening flames of funeral-pyres, which were Siva's eyes, encircled with innumerable skeletons, skulls, and bones of men, attended nearby by formidable, rejoicing demons and goblins, with loud, resounding howls of jackals (*śivā*)."

Correspondences between the two passages are the following: (1) the cemetery is compared with Śiva, skulls and skeletons as the ornaments of both being the chief point of comparison (BKM vs. 28); (2) Śiva is called Bhairava; (3) the word for "skeleton" is *kaṅkāla*; (4) there is a pun on *śiva* and *śivā* (BKM vs. 34), which in KSS is somewhat masked by the use of Bhairava for Śiva. It should be pointed out also that in KSS the epithet *sphūrjanmahāśivārāvaṁ* applies aptly only to the cemetery and that in BKM the verse containing the pun is separated by a number of verses from the comparison between the cemetery and Śiva. These details taken separately would not be very impressive, but the fact that the complex occurs in both texts makes it quite certain that the Bṛhatkathā also contained all these details.

With BKM l. c. 62a (Introductory story 43b) we may compare KSS 75. 51a.

BKM: gatvā dadarśa taṁ śuṣkaṁ rūkṣaṁ nīcam ivo
'ddhatam [8]

[8] *rūkṣaṁ* S, *rukṣaṁ* QRP, *vṛkṣaṁ* Ged. Lévi.

"When he had gone there, he saw the tree (*tarum* is in a later verse). It was dried up and *rūkṣa*; lofty (or, arrogant) as a low (mean) man."

KSS: tasya skandhe citādhūmadagdhasya kravyagandhinaḥ

"On the trunk of the tree, which was scorched by the smoke of funeral-pyres and smelt of raw flesh . . ." It seems to me that BKM's two adjectives *śuṣkaṁ* and *rūkṣaṁ* are parallels to the two epithets in KSS. *śuṣka* and *dagdha* are certainly equivalent in meaning, and *rūkṣa* is defined as "unpleasant, disagreeable to the sight, smell, etc." Therefore it seems to be capable of bearing much the same meaning as *kravyagandhin*, viz. "foul-smelling." If so, we may infer that the Bṛhatkathā contained something corresponding to these two adjectives.

BKM l. c. 74b, 75a (story 1, vs. 4):

dyutimān vajramukuṭas tasyāṁ tena suto 'jani
smarendumādhavā yasya lajjante rūpasaṁpadā

"She bore to him a brilliant son, Vajramukuṭa, the splendor of whose beauty put to shame the God of Love, the moon, and spring."

KSS 75. 62:

tasyā 'bhūd vajramukuṭas tanayo rūpaśauryayoḥ
kurvāṇo darpadalanaṁ smarasyā 'rijanasya ca

"He had a son, Vajramukuṭa, who destroyed the God of Love's pride in his beauty and the pride of enemies in their courage." The Bṛhatkathā had the comparison between Vajramukuṭa and the God of Love (*smara*), and the technique was the same as that seen in both the above verses—"Vajramukuṭa excelled the God of Love in beauty." Kṣemendra in rather commonplace fashion added that the moon and spring were excelled in the same quality, while Somadeva rather more artistically added another quality and another group of persons whom Vajramukuṭa excelled in that quality.

BKM l. c. 186 (story 3, vs. 3):

priyaḥ krīḍāśukas tasya babhūva bhuvi viśrutaḥ
sarvaśāstreṣu kuśalaḥ kalāsu ca vicakṣaṇaḥ

"He had a pet parrot of which he was fond, which was famous in

the world for its knowledge of all branches of learning and its skill in the arts."

KSS 77. 6:

tatra śāpāvatīrṇo 'bhūd divyavijñānavāñ śukaḥ
vidagdhacūḍāmaṇir ity ākhyayā sarvaśāstravit

"He had a parrot, godlike in its knowledge, learned in all branches of learning, named Vidagdhacūḍāmaṇi, which had been born in that incarnation because of a curse." Kṣemendra has another *śloka* describing the parrot, but of all his various epithets only *sarvaśāstravid*, or some equivalent, could have been in the *Bṛhatkathā*.

BKM l. c. 400 (story 7, vs. 12):

tāṁ candrabimbavadanāṁ vilokya stabakastanīm
svagṛhaṁ rajako gatvā babhūvā 'nañgatāpitaḥ [9]

"When the washerman had seen her with her face beautiful as the moon's disk and her breasts like clusters of blossoms, he went to his own house tormented by love."

KSS 80. 9:

indor lāvaṇyahāriṇyā tayā sa hṛtamānasaḥ
anviṣya tannāmakule kāmārto 'tha gṛhaṁ yayau

"His heart was captivated by that girl who surpassed the moon in beauty, and when he had inquired her name and family, he went home smitten with love." The similarity of other details in these two verses makes it probable that the comparison of the girl with the moon, common though the comparison is in this type of verse, was found in the Bṛhatkathā.

BKM l. c. 458 (story 8, vs. 40):

suvarṇavallarīramye ratnapādapakānane
sarvartuphalapuṣpāḍhye viśrāntaṁ sā tam abravīt

"As he rested in a grove of jewel-trees, which was pleasant with golden creepers and full of fruits and flowers of all seasons she said to him."

---

[9] b *°vānañgatāpitaḥ* MSS., *°va smaratāpitaḥ* ed.

KSS 81. 98:

nityasaṁnaddhasarvartu sadāpuṣpaphaladrumam
merupṛṣṭham ivā 'śeṣaṁ nirmitaṁ ratnakāñcanaiḥ

"(The city) had trees that always produced flowers and fruit, for all seasons were always present; like Mount Meru, it was all made of jewels and gold." The concept of all seasons being present at the same time was found in the Bṛhatkathā, and in much the same language as is found in these two verses.

BKM l. c. 463a (story 8, vs. 45a):

janmamṛtyujarāvyādhivarjitaṁ divyasaurabham

The preceding verse has *sarvasiddhipradaṁ:* "(My two cities) confer all bliss, are free from birth, death, old age, and sickness, and are filled with divine fragrance."

KSS 81. 101b:

na jarā 'tra na mṛtyuś ca bādhate sarvakāmade

"Neither old age nor death invades them, and they grant all desires." The two concepts found in KSS as well as in BKM were in the Bṛhatkathā.

BKM l. c. 465 (story 8, vs. 47):

suhṛt pitā suto bandhuḥ svāmī sarvam ayaṁ mama
kulonnataḥ sattvaśīlas tad asmai tvaṁ mayā 'rpitā

"This Sattvaśīla, of exalted family, is my friend, my father, my son, my relation, my master, my all. So to him I give you."

KSS 81. 103:

yady evaṁ tat sute hy asmai mayā dattā 'sy anindite
sattvaśīlāya vīrāya suhṛde bāndhavāya ca

"If this is so, I give you, blameless daughter, to this man, the hero Sattvaśīla, who is my friend and relation." Sattvaśīla, in fact, was no relation of the speaker's, so that perhaps Kṣemendra represents the original more exactly. In any event the original had this exaggerated statement of the speaker's attachment to Sattvaśīla.

BKM l. c. 493-495 (story 10, vss. 4-6):

dṛṣṭir yuvabhir ānandasmaragarvataraṁgite
yatkāntisalile magnā samuddhartuṁ na pāryate 4

bhrūlāsyavīcitarale hārahaṅsasitormiṇi
lāvaṇyamānase yasyāḥ kaṭākṣaiḥ śapharāyitam 5
unnidracandravadanāṁ tāṁ vilokya nijālayam
gato na lebhe sa dhṛtiṁ sārthabhraṣṭa ivā 'dhvagaḥ [10] 6

"Young men could not extricate (or, save) their glances which plunged into the ocean of her beauty, which billowed with the insolence of joy and love. Her charm was like lake Mānasa, rippling with the waves of the dance of her brows, its waves white with the swans of her pearl-necklace; her coquettish glances flickered like silvery *śaphara*-fish. When he had looked upon her with her face beautiful as the shining moon, he went home bereft of calmness of mind, like a traveller who has lost his caravan."

KSS 84. 7-8:

sa tām ālokya lāvaṇyarasanirbharanirjharām
ālakṣyakucakumbhāgrāṁ valitrayataraṅgitām 7
yauvanadviradasye 'va krīḍāmajjanavāpikām
sadyo 'bhūt smarabāṇaughasaṁtāpahṛtacetanaḥ 8

"When he saw her, who with the full streams of her beauty, the tips of her breasts like pitchers half-revealed, and the three wrinkles of her waist like waves, resembled a lake for the sportive plungings of the elephant of youth, he was at once robbed of his senses by the anguish caused him by the showers of Love's arrows." The basic comparison of the girl to a body of water was in the Bṛhatkathā; the two texts have dissimilar details, none of which can be referred to the original.

BKM l. c. 497-500 (story 10, vss. 8-11):

atrāntare jalanidhiṁ saṁdhyārakte divākare
tāpād iva klāntatanau praviṣṭe padminīpriye 8
dikṣu kālāgarusyandanīlais timirasaṁcayaiḥ
abhisārocitaṁ veṣam āśritāsv iva tatkṣaṇāt 9
udite pūrvadikkāntāsīmantamaṇimauktike
śaśāṅke śaṁkaraplusṭakāmasaṁjīvanauṣadhe 10

---

[10] 4a °*garva*° RST, °*gurvī*° Q, °*gurvi*° G, *yuvanirānandasmayagurvī* Ped. (This reading of P and the ed. admits of interpretation: "The young man's glance weighed down by melancholy wonder plunged into the billowing ocean of her beauty and could not be extricated.") b *magnāḥ* MSS. ed., *magnā* Hertel (*Studia Indo-iranica, Ehrengabe für Wilhelm Geiger*, p. 94).

jyotsnāvilāsavikasatprabhāśubhre nabhaḥsthale
dugdhābdhiśāyinaḥ śaureḥ sudhālipta ivo 'rasi [11] 11

"Meanwhile the sun, the friend of lotuses, became red at twilight and, as if its body were wearied by heat, sank into the ocean. At that moment masses of darkness, dark as drops of black aloe, were put on by the quarters of the sky as a garment suitable for a rendezvous. The moon rose, the pearl which is the jewel in the headdress of the maiden of the eastern quarter, the elixir which brings to life the God of Love consumed by Śiva's fire. The firmament was white with the gleaming radiance of the moonlight's brilliance and seemed like Viṣṇu's nectar-smeared breast as he lay on the ocean of milk."

KSS 84. 12-13:

tadadarśanaduḥkhāgnisaṁtāpene 'va ca jvalan
lohito nipapātā "śu bhāsvān apy aparāmbudhau 12
tāṁ vijñāyai 'va sumukhīṁ naktam abhyantare gatām
udiyāya śanaiś candras tanmukhābjavinirjitaḥ 13

"The sun at once sank red into the western ocean, as if inflamed with the fire of grief at seeing her no more. The moon, that was surpassed by the lotus of her countenance, knowing that the fair-faced one had gone in for the night, slowly rose." The setting of the sun and the rising of the moon are common to the two texts and to be referred to the Bṛhatkathā. Of the details, only the redness of the sun at sunset can be referred to the original and the reason for the redness is dissimilar in the two texts.

BKM l. c. 559 (story 11, vs. 7):

sevyatāṁ lalanābhogaḥ pīyatāṁ pāṭalaṁ madhu
na hy ananto vasanto 'yaṁ vadatī 've 'ti kokile [12]

"(In the spring), when the cuckoo seemed to say: 'Enjoy the love of women, drink red wine, for this spring is not endless.'"

---

[11] 10b °*pluṣṭa*° MSS., °*klpta*° ed.; °*kāma*° QGed., °*smara*° RST; °*ṣadhe* QGRST, °*ṣadham* ed.; °*pluṣṭasaṁjīvanamahoṣadhau* P. 11a °*vilāsa*° QGed., °*vikāsa*° RS, °*vibhāsa*° T, °*prakāsa*° P; °*vikasat*° RTP, °*vilasat*° QGSed.; °*sthale* QGRT, °*stale* SPed. b *śauraih* QGRSTed., *śauraḥ* P; *ivor*° MSS., *ivaur*° ed.

[12] a *pāṭalaṁ* G, *pātalaṁ* other MSS. and ed.

KSS 85. 8:

śṛṇvaṇś ca taddrumāgrasthakokilodīritāṁ giram
saṁbhogaikarasasyā ”jñām iva mānasajanmanaḥ

“ Hearing the note uttered by the cuckoos which sat on the tree-tops in that garden, like the edict of the God of Love who is wholly pleased by enjoyment.” This accompaniment of the spring-season was contained in some form in the Bṛhatkathā; Kṣemendra seems to have expanded the purport of the cuckoo’s song.

BKM l. c. 575-576 (story 11, vss. 23-24):

niḥśabdajanasaṁcāre kuto ’pi musaladhvanim
śrutvai ’va saṁjātakiṇau dhūnvānā karapallavau 23
daṣṭāv ive ’tya madhupair utphullakamalāśayā
hā hatā ’smī ’ti cukrośa tārasītkāraśālinī [13] 24

“ As people went about silently she merely heard the noise made by a pestle and her blossomlike hands became covered with bruises as if they were bitten by bees which had come to them thinking them open blossoms. She shook her hands and in a shrill cry of pain lamented: ‘ Alas! I am hurt! ’ ”

KSS 85. 26:

dadarśa tatra tasyāś ca cinvan śāśruḥ paricchadaḥ
ālīnabhramarau padmāv iva hastau kiṇāṅkitau

“ When her weeping attendants examined her, they saw that her hands were covered with bruises and looked like lotuses upon which bees had settled.” The bees were in the original; Kṣemendra has rather ineptly compared the black bruises not to the bees but to stings.

BKM l. c. 621 (story 12, vs. 41):

uktve ’ti cikṣepa nṛpaḥ sahasā salile tanum
smaradāvāgninirvāṇādhiye ’vā ”hitasāhasaḥ

“ When he had said this, the king suddenly threw himself into the sea, committing the rash act as if he thought to quench the forest-fire of love.”

---

[13] 23a *musa*° QGRST, *muśa*° Ped. b *śrutvaiva* RTP, *śrutveti* G, *śrutvāpi* Q, *śrutvā ca* S, *śrutvā tadā jātakiṇau* ed.; *dhūnv*° QGRST, *dhunv*° Ped. 24a *daṣṭa ivetya* ed., *daṣṭāvijitya* P.

KSS 86. 85:

tad dṛṣṭvai 'vā 'numārge 'syāḥ sa rājā "tmānam akṣipat
vāridhāv atra kāmāgnisaṁtāpasye 'va śāntaye

"The moment the king saw this, he threw himself into the sea after her, as if to cool the flames of love's fire."

BKM l. c. 693-696 (story 14, vss. 6-9):

tatas tamasi so 'paśyac cauraṁ tālam ivo 'nnatam
niḥśabdalaghusaṁcāraṁ kva cit pārśvavilokinam 6
kva cid vidhṛtaniḥśvāsaṁ kva cid vakrīkṛtākṛtim
yakṣmāṇam iva tṛṣṇādhyaṁ durbhikṣam iva duḥsaham 7
viyogam iva socchvāsaṁ kalpāntam iva dāhinam
sarvasvāpaharaṁ ghoraṁ kṣapāntam iva viplutam 8
saṁdhicchedeṣu kuśalaṁ pracchannam iva durjanam
vilokya taṁ nṛpo 'pṛcchat svairaṁ viśvāsaghātakam [14] 9

"Then in the darkness he saw a thief. He was lofty as a palm-tree. He went with light, noiseless step and now looked to all sides, now held his breath, now bent his body. He was like consumption which causes thirst, like unendurable famine, like the sighing separation of lovers, like the burning dissolution of the world. Terrible, he caused loss of all sleep (or, he stole everything), like a troubled dawn. He seemed like a secret scoundrel, clever in making breaches in walls. When the king saw him, he cautiously asked the traitor."

KSS 88. 15-16:

ekākī cā "ttaśastro 'tra bhraman so 'paśyad ekataḥ
ekaṁ prākārapṛṣṭhena yāntaṁ kam api pūruṣam 15
niḥśabdapadavinyāsavicitragatikauśalam
saśaṅkalolanayanaṁ paśyantaṁ pṛṣṭhato muhuḥ 16

"As he wandered about alone and armed, he saw in one place a man going along alone on the rampart. He was wonderfully dexterous in his movements as he placed his feet noiselessly; he looked behind him repeatedly with anxiously rolling eyes." Kṣemendra's

[14] 6a *tamasi* MSS., *tam api* ed. b °*laghu*° MSS., °*jana*° ed. 7a *vidhṛtaniḥśvāsaṁ* G, *ca dhṛtaniśvāsaṁ* Q, *vidhṛtiniśvāsaṁ* RST, *dhṛtaviniḥśvāsaṁ* P, *nibhṛtaniḥśvāsaṁ* ed.; °*kṛtākṛtim* RSTPed., °*kṛtātmakam* QG. b *durbhikṣam* MSS., *dāvāgnim* ed. 8b *kṣapāntam* QGRST, *kalpāntam* ed., *kṣapāsaṁcaranaṁ priyam* P. 9b *'pṛcchat* MSS., *'vādīt* ed.

6b and Somadeva's 16 are almost identical in content and represent the original; the three *ślokas* which follow in Kṣemendra are his own addition.

BKM l. c. 893 (story 16, vs. 129):

na nāmaśaṅkhadhavalaṁ śaṅkhapālaṁ mahākulam
mayā 'pi śaṅkhacūḍena sattvabhaṅgāt kalaṅkyate [15]

"The great family, whose protector is Śaṅkha, is white with the shells (*śaṅkha*) in its names. I, Śaṅkhacūḍa, must not stain it by causing the downfall of its virtue."

KSS 90. 141:

na cā 'haṁ malinīkartuṁ śaṅkhapālakulaṁ śuci
kalaṅka iva tīkṣṇāṅśubimbaṁ śakṣyāmi sanmate

"I cannot, oh noble man, defile the pure race of Śaṅkhapāla, as a spot defiles the disk of the moon." Kṣemendra seems to have introduced the frigid pun on the word *śaṅkha*.

BKM l. c. 895-898 (story 16, vss. 131-134):

uktve 'ti mātrā 'nugate yāte tasmin kṣaṇād abhūt
uccaṇḍākāṇḍakalpāntavātavyākulitaṁ jagat 131
kāladordaṇḍaṣaṇḍābhāspaṣṭāghaṭṭitadiktaṭāḥ
uttasthur makarotphālakarālāḥ sāgarormayaḥ 132
tataś caṇḍāṅśutaptasya sumeror iva raśmibhiḥ
abhūd aurvānalene 'va pūritaṁ piñjaraṁ nabhaḥ 133
āgataṁ garuḍaṁ jñātvā sūcitaṁ pakṣamārutaiḥ
āruroha sadāvadhyaśilāṁ jīmūtavāhanaḥ [16] 134

"After he had said this, he went off followed by his mother. At once the world was filled with the terrible, unexpected wind of the end of the world. The waves of the sea arose, terrible with the leaping of *makara*-monsters, and the horizon was clearly touched by the likeness of a multitude of black arms (or, the breasts of the sky-maidens were clearly touched by the likeness of a multitude

[15] a *śāṅkhapālaṁ* Q. It is possible that we should read °*pāla*, i. e. "the great race of *Śaṅkhapāla*."

[16] 132a °*ṣaṇḍā*° QGRST, °*śaṅkhā*° Ped.; °*spaṣṭā*° QGP, °*spaṣṭa*° RST, °*śchaṭā*° ed.; °*ghaṭṭi*° RST, °*ghaṭi*° QGPed. b °*otphāla*° RST, °*otplāva*° QG, °*otsphullāḥ* P, °*āsphāra*° ed. 134b *sadāvadhyaśilāṁ* P, *sadāśailavindhyaṁ* RS, *sadāvindhyaśaila* T, *mudāvindhyaśilāṁ* Q, *mudāvadhyaśilām* G, *madābaddhaḥ śilāṁ* ed.

of Kāla's arms). The sky became ruddy as if filled by the submarine fire or by the rays of Mount Meru heated by the sun. When Jīmūtavāhana saw that Garuḍa had come, knowing it by the breezes made by his wings, he mounted the rock where the snakes were always killed."

KSS 90. 147-149:

tāvac cā "sannapakṣīndrapakṣānilacalāṅs tarūn
vilokyā 'tra sa mā me 'ti nivāraṇaparān iva 147
matvā garuḍavelāṁ ca prāptāṁ jīmūtavāhanaḥ
parārthaprāṇado vadhyaśilām adhyāruroha tām 148
pavanāghūrṇite cā 'bdhau sphuradratnaprabhādṛśā
taṁ sattvātiśayaṁ tasya paśyatī 'va savismayam 149

"Meanwhile he saw the trees swaying in the wind of the wings of approaching lord of the birds, and seeming to be intent upon uttering cries of dissuasion. He thought that the moment of Garuḍa's arrival was at hand, and, giving up his life for another, mounted upon the rock of sacrifice. The sea, churned by the wind, seemed with the eyes of its bright-flashing jewels to be gazing in astonishment at his extraordinary courage." The original had some description of the wind caused by the bird's wings and of its effect upon the sea.

BKM l. c. 1044 (story 19, vs. 32):

tataḥ kālena sā putram asūta ravivarcasam
kuntī 'va karṇaṁ saṁpūrṇarājalakṣaṇalakṣitam [17]

"Then in the course of time she bore a son marked with all the signs of a king, splendid as the sun, as Kuntī bore Karṇa." (Karṇa was the son of Sūrya, the sun; hence the epithet *ravivarcas*. Perhaps also *putram asūta* plays on Karṇa's name *Sūtaputra*.)

KSS 93. 47:

sā 'pi tasmād dhanavatī sagarbhā 'bhūd vaṇiksutā
kāle ca suṣuve putraṁ lakṣaṇānumitāyatim

"Dhanavatī, the merchant's daughter, became pregnant by him, and in the course of time bore a son, whose future could be inferred from his auspicious marks." Kṣemendra bethought himself of the similar circumstances of Karṇa's birth and introduced a simile and

[17] b *karṇaṁ* QGRSP, *varṇa* Ted.

puns, where the original referred only to the auspicious marks of royalty (*lakṣaṇa*).

BKM l. c. 1073 (story 20, vs. 8):

tāṁ vīkṣya manmathaśarāsāravyākulito 'bhavat
dattaśāpa ivā 'nekasāyakābhihatair mṛgaiḥ [18]

"When he saw her, he was agitated by Love's shower of arrows, as if he had been cursed by the deer which his multitude of arrows had struck."

KSS 94. 21a:

acintayac ca puṣpeṣoḥ patitaḥ śaragocare

"And he, having now fallen within the range of the Love-god's arrows, reflected." The Love-god's arrows were in the Bṛhatkathā; Kṣemendra has characteristically enlarged on the figure.

This selection of the *kāvya*-passages in one portion of the Bṛhatkathāmañjarī, incomplete as the list is, sufficiently illustrates my contention that Kṣemendra at times found in his original the model, or at least the suggestion, for the figures which he elaborated. But in general it is clear enough that his method of handling the *kāvya*-portions of the work was the direct opposite of that which he adopted in the more strictly narrative portions. In the latter he condensed (as could be demonstrated well enough by a comparison of Kṣemendra and Somadeva in these portions), in the former he expanded. The large number of ornamental passages for which Somadeva has no equivalents shows further that Kṣemendra's chief interest was *kāvya*, while Somadeva's was narrative.

The story of Madanasundarī, who exchanged the heads of her husband and her brother (Kṣemendra's story 7, Somadeva's 6), is instructive. Somadeva tells the story in 54 verses; of these all are narrative verses with sufficient ornament to relieve any severity that might inhere in strict narrative. Only six *pādas* might be excised without harm to the narrative; these form a *devatāstuti*. Kṣemendra, on the other hand, tells the story in 30 verses, of which 11 are pure ornament and might be omitted without any loss to the narrative. Three of these *ślokas* are a *deva-*

[18] a °*śarāsāravyākulitobhavat* QRST, °*śarasāhasavyākulobhavat* P, *śaravyākulīkṛtacetanaḥ* ed.

tāstuti corresponding to Somadeva's one and a half *ślokas*. The remaining eight *kāvya*-verses have no counterpart in Somadeva. Seven of them may be given here as examples of the pearls which he embroiders on the shoddy of his work. Four of them are a description of women bathing in a lake (BKM l. c. 392-395; story 7, vss. 4-7):

snāntīnāṁ vaktrapadmaiś ca dormṛṇālavanais tathā
tāsāṁ bhrūvīcijālaiś ca punaruktam abhūt saraḥ 4
varāṅganānāṁ kucayoḥ śaśaplutanakhavraṇaḥ
svacchaphenāvalīcīraiḥ prītyā 'bandhī 'va vāriṇā 5
snānadhautāñjanasitā tāsāṁ dṛṣṭir vyarocata
niṣkṛṣṭakālakūṭāṅśā caṭule 'vā 'mṛtacchaṭā 6
snātotthitā vāridhārāhāribhis tāḥ stanair babhuḥ
dṛṣṭāgrabisasūtrāsyaiś cakravākair ivā 'ṅkitāḥ[19] 7

"The lake was duplicated as they bathed by the lotuses of their faces, the groves of lotus-fibres which were their arms, and the multitude of waves which were their brows. Finger-nail scratches like 'the leaps of a hare' on the beautiful women's breasts were lovingly bound up, as it were, by the water with bandages made of rows of clear foam.[20] Their eyes shone forth white when the collyrium had been washed off in bathing, like the trembling mass of nectar when the portion of black poison had been extracted from it.[21] When they had bathed and stood forth, with their breasts bearing torrents of water, they seemed as if adorned with *cakravāka*-birds in whose mouths were lotus-fibres with only the tips visible."

The other three, describing Madanasundarī who was a girl of the *rajaka*-caste, with their high-flown language seem to have been composed with humorous intent (BKM l. c. 397-399; story 7, vss. 9-11):

---

[19] 4a *snāntīnāṁ* QRST, *snātīnāṁ* G, *nārīṇāṁ* P, *tāṁ nītāṁ* ed.; °*mṛṇālav*° RSTP, °*mṛṇālīv*° QGed. b *bhrū*° MSS., *bhū*° ed. 5a *śaśapl*° QP, other MSS. illegible, *sasaṁpl*° ed.; °*vraṇaḥ* QGST, °*vraṇāḥ* Ped. b *prītyābandhīva* QGRST, *prītyevābandhi* Ped. 6a *snātadh*° ST. b °*ṭāṅśā* QRS, °*ṭāśā* GTPed.; °*levām*° MSS., °*laivām*° ed. 7a *snāto*° RSTPed., *snāno*° QG.

[20] The various forms of erotic scratching, including the *śaśapluta(ka)*, are described in the Hindu handbooks of *kāma*. Penzer has a note on the subject in *The Ocean of Story* 5, pp. 193-195.

[21] Nectar and the poison *kālakūṭa* were among the products of the churning of the ocean.

snātvā bāhulatākṣepataralotsarpibhir muhuḥ
yasyā lāvaṇyasalilaiḥ prakṣālitam ivā 'mbaram 9
kaṭākṣaśapharotphālā yā vibhramataraṁgitā
rajakānām iva gṛhe jātā mūrtimatī nadī 10
muhur līlāsmitasmeracchāyāvyājair dideśa yā
yātrotsave janasye 'va dhautacīnapaṭāvalīm [22] 11

"As she bathed the sky seemed to be repeatedly washed by the oceans of her charm, which mounted up in waves because of the tossing of her creeper-like arms. Her amorous glances like the leaping of fish and her wave-like coquettish movements made her seem like a river born in human form in the house of the washermen. She seemed to display again and again a row of shining silken cloths in the people's festival procession by her sportively smiling laugh which counterfeited their color." [23]

[22] 9a °*taralotsarpibhir* QGRST, °*taralotkṣepitair* ed., °*salilotsarpibhir* P. 10a °*otphālā* ed., °*otphullā* Q, °*otplāvā* G, °*āstārā* P, °*kṣapātaśapharā* RST. 11b °*cīna*° RST, °*vīra*° P, °*pīta*° ed., *dhautāñjana*° G, *yautācchanna*° Q.

[23] In *kāvya* the convention is that a smile is white.

K'UEI CHI'S COMMENTARY ON WEI-SHIH-ER-SHIH-LUN [1]

CLARENCE H. HAMILTON
OBERLIN COLLEGE

THE VALUE attaching to K'uei Chi's commentary on the translation by his master Hsüan Chuang of Vasubandhu's Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi, Viṁśatikā,[2] is that it shows us how that work was understood in China at the time when the Wei Shih (唯識) or Vijñaptimātra system of Buddhist philosophy was put into its best form for Chinese study. In my paper on "Hsüan Chuang and the Wei Shih Philosophy" [3] I have shown how the noted pilgrim-translator gained his knowledge from the living masters of this philosophy in the India of his day. After his return to China Hsüan Chuang, engaged in the exacting task of translating the many manuscripts brought from abroad, had the organized assistance of numerous scholars and disciples. But he chose K'uei Chi in particular to receive his explanations of Vasubandhu's thought while the translations from that philosopher were in progress. This precious material, delivered first as oral instruction, was written down by K'uei Chi and compiled by him into two noteworthy works, the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun-shu-chi* [4] and the *Wei-shih-er-shih-lun-shu-chi.* Full account has been taken of the former in La Vallée Poussin's recent translation of the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun.*[5] To make some observations concerning the latter is the object of the present paper which is based upon an examination of the first half of this commentary undertaken in connection with a detailed study of the *Wei-shih-er-shih-lun* itself.

The whole commentary is divided into four sections (卷), two in a first volume of 110 pages and two in the second of 146 pages, making in all a work of 256 pages (Western count) as published

---

[1] 唯識二十論述記, 唐京兆大慈恩寺翻經沙門窺基撰.

[2] Published by Sylvain Lévi in 1925 in the Bibliothèque de L'Ecole des Hautes Études (Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion).

[3] *JAOS.*, 51. 291-308.

[4] 成唯識論述記.

[5] *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi: La Siddhi de Hiuan-Tsang* (Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1929).

by the Kiangsi Buddhist Publishing House.[6] As K'uei Chi's commentaries form no part of the Chinese Tripiṭaka they must be read in independent editions.

Chinese translations of Vasubandhu's Viṁśatikā had been attempted earlier by the Indian Buddhist monks Prajñāruci and Paramārtha in the Wei (魏)[7] and Ch'en (陳)[7] dynasties respectively. The circumstances under which Hsüan Chuang now made a new and authoritative one in the T'ang (唐) are set forth by K'uei Chi in an instructive introductory passage. Three Sanskrit texts were at hand, it seems, though they are not specifically described.[8] Comparing these and looking over the former translations Hsüan Chuang found many deficiencies in the work of his Indian predecessors. "He knew these could not defend the profound doctrine (of the treatise)," says K'uei Chi, "the meanings being mostly deficient and erroneous, the tones (聲) not being sensed clearly, and the phrases redundant and vulgar, not in one passage only but in many, the detailed indication of which would be burdensome."[9] This accounts for the fact that "from the beginning (these translations) have been read rather than studied even by thorough scholars."[10] Accordingly, "On the first day of the sixth moon in the year Hsing-yu (辛酉), the first year of the Lung-so (龍朔) reign in the Great T'ang Dynasty,[11] at the Yü-hua-ch'ing-fu Hall (玉花慶福殿), this treatise began again to be translated. I, K'uei Chi, received the meaning and wrote it down.[12] On the eighth day of the month the work in all its detail was finished. Deletions had been made, the whole put in order, faulty places repaired and deficiencies made good. When we looked over the new book it closely resembled Vasubandhu's."

Hsüan Chuang's personal part in this task, namely dictating the translation and expounding the ideas to K'uei Chi, was limited

[6] Kiangsi K'ê-ching-ch'u (江西刻經處).

[7] Nanjio, *Catalogue of the Buddhist Tripiṭaka*, Nos. 1238 and 1239.

[8] In comment connected with the seventh gāthā it is said 勘三梵本: "comparing three Sanskrit texts."

[9] 知其莫閑奧埋義多垂失謬不悟聲明。詞甚繁鄙非只一條難具陳述.

[10] 自古通學閱而靡究.

[11] I. e., A. D. 661.

[12] Literally, "received the meaning, grasping the pen" (受旨執筆).

to the seven or eight days mentioned. This had important results for the disciple. "My master did not regard me as stupid"[13] K'uei Chi remarks with pardonable pride, "he commissioned me to make manifest his meaning. While the translating was going on, I received his explanations and out of them compiled a commentary." The responsibility was not, however, without its difficulties. K'uei Chi confesses that he did not understand everything which his honored teacher passed on to him. The time was too short to get everything straightened out. "When we came to meanings distorted and confused," he says, "and to expressions of remote reference, we let the meanings go until I could get more instruction and interpret them at some later time. But," he adds in eloquent lament, "before the task was finished, the instruction ended, so that the mysterious source was interrupted and flowed no longer; the deep soul (of the meaning) remains in the dark forever hidden.[14] We may say that the precious pearl is easily entrusted, but insight into the treasury of the law is difficult. (What now remains) is superficial in meaning and diffuse in style!"

These words of K'uei Chi warn us that we may not expect to obtain Hsüan Chuang's final understanding of the *Wei-shih-er-shih-lun* from the commentary, even though it is compiled of the master's own utterances. Had the latter been able to give more time to instructing K'uei Chi on the interpretation, it would have been a more satisfactory performance from the disciple's point of view. It is to be regretted, indeed, that Hsüan Chuang could not have composed his own commentary on the translation. But there were reasons. When we consult Hui-li's Biography of Hsüan Chuang[15] we find that from the fifth year of Hsien Ch'ing (顯慶) to the third year of Lung So (龍朔), i. e., A. D. 660-663.[16] Hsüan Chuang was primarily occupied with the translation of the vast scriptures of the Prajñā Pāramitā, the *Ta-pan-j'o-po-lo-mi-to-ching*,[17] the ślokas alone of which number two hundred thou-

[13] 我帥不以庸愚命旌厥趣.

[14] This sounds like a quotation, but I have not been able to trace it.
玄源見擁而無披. 幽靈守昏而永翳

[15] 大慈恩寺三藏法師傳. 慧立本釋彥悰箋. Nanjio, No. 1494.

[16] Really almost a four-year period from the beginning of A. D. 660 until the latter part of 663.

[17] 大般若波羅蜜多經 Nanjio, No. 1.

sand. John Estlin Carpenter has remarked that "The labours of Jerome in his cell at Bethlehem on the Latin rendering of the Hebrew of the Old Testament were child's play compared with Hsüan Chuang's task in producing this version," which is really "a group of works estimated at twenty-five times the length of the whole Bible."[18] As the eight days spent on the *Wei-shih-er-shih-lun* occurred in A. D. 661, which was the second year of the greater enterprise, we can readily understand why Hsüan Chuang had no more time to devote to the exposition of the treatise. It is further probable that Hsüan Chuang, having already in A. D. 659 translated the greater Wei Shih treatise, the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun* (成唯識論),[19] in which the arguments of the system are set forth exhaustively, felt less necessity to expand the *Wei-shih-er-shih-lun,* which is really an elementary treatise, into greater detail. Indeed it is evident from the numerous references to the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun* in the commentary before us that Hsüan Chuang's exposition of the ideas in the smaller treatise drew upon the detail already worked out in the larger one. These considerations are sufficient to justify both the limited time spent on the translation of the *Wei-shih-er-shih-lun* and his leaving it to K'uei Chi to assemble and organize the material of the commentary by himself.

So much for the circumstances surrounding the composition of K'uei Chi's Commentary on the *Wei-shih-er-shih-lun.* They were not ideal, perhaps, but we may not think, because the disciple laments his humble ability for the task, that he has not left us a valuable work. When we advance into the body of the commentary we find that he has arranged his material with meticulous care, finding something to say for almost every word and every phrase of the text. He tells us that Vasubandhu wrote the Viṁśatikā first and the Triṁśika second, a bit of information which I have not encountered elsewhere. He does not cite evidence for the statement, so we are unable to tell whether it is a valid tradition transmitted from India or an inference by Hsüan Chuang from the character of the literature. If it is true then we are closer to Vasubandhu's original formulation of his idealism in the Viṁśatikā than in the Triṁśikā. K'uei Chi further points out that the Viṁśatikā has Vasubandhu's own comment added to the twenty

[18] *Buddhism and Christianity,* pp. 13-14.

[19] Nanjio, No. 1197.

verses, whereas the Triṁśikā, although more advanced technically, consists of verses only, comments having been added by others. He reminds us further that the purpose of the Viṁśatikā is to meet the objections of outsiders, a fact which makes it useful for a first study of the doctrine.

In the Large Buddhist Encyclopedia[20] edited by Ting Fu-pao (丁福保) we are informed that K'uei Chi learned five Indian languages. Our present commentary bears evidence of his knowledge of Sanskrit only. In making definite reference to Sanskrit terms K'uei Chi usually transliterates into Chinese sounds before giving their meaning. I have not gone into the question of the pronunciation of Chinese words at the T'ang Dynasty capital in Hsüan Chuang's time. It is possible that a careful study of the question would reveal a closer agreement with the Sanskrit sounds than we are able to detect in our pronunciations today. Examples of K'uei Chi's usuage are as follows:

Sanskrit	Transliteration.	Meaning.
vijñapti	毗若底; *p'i-jo-ti*	識; *shih*
mātratā	摩咀剌多; *mo-chü-la-to*	唯; *wei*
viṁśatikā	憑始迦; *p'ing-shih-chia*	二十; *er shih*
śāstra	奢薩咀羅; *she-sa-chü-lo*	論; *lun*
svapnavat	伊縛筏; *sun-chüan-fa*	如夢; *ju meng*
pudgala	補特伽羅; *pu-t'e-chia-lo*	數取趣; *su-ch'ü-ch'ü*

Throughout the commentary there is constant reference to other schools of Buddhistic thought whose arguments Vasubandhu's verses are meant to refute. The orginal Sanskrit text of Vasubandhu makes explicit mention of the Vaiśeṣikas and Vaibhāṣikas only; and that reference is limited to the passage refuting both the atomic and the unitary concepts of the structure of an external universe.[21] But K'uei Chi's commentary traces every refuted position to its origin in specific schools or, in a few cases, to the naïve notions of the man on the street. In the first half of the commentary we find mention of specific schools together with their positions on certain questions as follows:

---

[20] 佛學大辭典, p. 2668 中.

[21] See Sylvain Lévi's edition of Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi, 1925. P. 6, third line from bottom; and p. 7, tenth line from the top.

1. Sarvāstivādins (薩婆多):	Outer objects exist as well as mind.[22]
2. Śūnya(tā)vādins (空見外道):	Inner mind as well as objects do not exist.
3. Sautrāntikas (經量部):	Apart from mind there are no distinct mental activities.
4. Mahāsaṅghikas (大衆部):	Infernal guards etc. are true sentient beings.
5. Vaiśeṣikas (吠世師迦 or 勝論者):	The substance of outer objects is one thing.
6. Sammatīyas (正量部):	
7. Vaibhāṣikas (毗婆沙師):	There is no combining together of several atoms.
8. Vātsīputrīyas (犢子部):	Same contention as Mahāsaṅghikas above.

In method of exposition the commentary draws abundantly upon other Buddhist literature containing the doctrines of the Wei Shih School. Quotations and references occur frequently. In the first half of the work there is a full dozen of sūtras and śāstras which are made to yield their contribution. Listed in the order of their appearance in Nanjio's catalog they are as follows.

1. Hua-yen-ching (華嚴經):
   Avataṃsakasūtra. Nanjio No. 87
2. Leng-ch'ieh-ching (楞伽經):
   Laṅkāvatārasūtra. " No. 175-6

---

[22] Cf. the following for the several schools:

1. 外境如心是有
2. 內心如境是無
3. 離心無別心所
4. 獄卒等是實有情
5. 外境體是一物
6. 境多念心唯一剎那
7. 非諸極微有相合義

The many references to other schools show that in Hsüan Chuang's time traditional memories of a rich intellectual environment in which the Viṁśatikā arose were still preserved. The Sanskrit text itself, taking this for granted, does not stop to specify the opponents, and consequently leaves us unenlightened.

3. Chieh-shen-mi-ching (解深密經):
Sandhinirmocanasūtra. " No. 247
4. She-ta-sheng-lun-shih 攝大乘論釋):
Mahāyānasaṁparigraha-śāstra-vyākhyā. " No. 1171
5. Kuan-so-yüan-yüan-lun (觀所緣緣論):
Ālambanapratyayadhyānaśāstra. " No. 1173
6. She-ta-sheng-lun (攝大乘論):
Mahāyānasaṁparigrahaśāstra. " No. 1183
7. Shih-ti-ching-lun (十地經論);
Daśabhūmikasūtra-śāstra. " No. 1194
8. Fu-ti-ching-lun (佛地經論):
Buddhabhūmisūtra-śāstra. " No. 1195
9. Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun (成唯識論):
Vijñaptimātratāsiddhiśāstra. " No. 1197
10. Pien-chung-pien-lun (辨中邊論):
Madhyāntavibhāgaśāstra. " No. 1244
11. Pien-chung-pien-lun-sung (辨中邊論頌):
Madhyāntavibhāgaśāstra (verses). " No. 1245
12. Chü-she-lun (俱舍論):
Abhidharmakośaśāstra. " No. 1267

In addition to the citation of these scriptures, the method of commentarial exposition further employs analysis of the arguments with the tools of technical logic. In connection with the explanation of the first sentence of the treatise, K'uei Chi quotes from the Nyāyamukha of the logician Dignāga and thereafter makes use of such terms as the following in quite the technical sense of that treatise as translated by Hsüan Chuang.[23]

Neng-li-neng-p'o (能立能破): proof and refutation.
Tsung (宗): proposition.
Li-tsung (立宗): to formulate a proposition (lay down a proposition).
Kuo-shih (過失): fallacy.
Hsien-liang (現量): evidence of direct perception.

[23] 因明正理門論本 Nanjio, No. 1224. This work has been recently translated into English by Giuseppe Tucci in the *Materialien zur Kunde des Buddhismus*, 15 Heft, Heidelberg, 1930.

Pi-liang (比量): inference.
Li-liang (立量): to prove, or establish proof.
Liang-yün (量云): logically speaking, speaking in terms of proof etc.

We cannot say that K'uei Chi's commentary adds directly to our knowledge of Buddhist formal logic. But it can be instructive as showing concretely how the Chinese debaters conceived of its method in the process of actual argumentation. It is beyond the scope of this paper to enter discussion concerning the subject matter of the *Wei-shih-er-shih-lun* as handled by K'uei Chi. Results of that study will be set forth more appropriately in the presentation of an English translation of the *Wei-shih-er-shih-lun* itself.

THE MANDAIC GOD PTAHIL

Carl H. Kraeling
Yale University

One of the most interesting figures of the Mandaic pantheon is that of the god Ptahil. Interest attaches to him readily because of his prominence in the bulky volumes of the Mandean texts, and because of the uncertainty which still exists to-day with regard to the interpretation of his person and his origin. Since the days when western scholars first began to concern themselves with the Mandean traditions, one thing has continually been evident about Ptahil, namely that he is the Mandaic demiurge, the creator of the present cosmos. Two questions, upon the answer to which the final interpretation of his person and his origin depends, have, however, never been satisfactorily answered. These questions are: (1) Is Ptahil, like the demiurges of other syncretistic faiths, essentially an "evil deity"? (2) What is the etymology and the meaning of his name, and what light has the name to shed upon the problem of his origin and identity?

These two questions have in the past received a disturbing variety of answers. Wilhelm Brandt evolved the conception that Ptahil was originally an evil power, which, under the influence of developing monotheism, was gradually freed of its dualistic associations and identified with a beneficent creative agent (Gabriel Sh^{e}liḥa), until there remained of its older evil self only the name proper to it at the beginning.[1] By contrast, Karl Kessler insists: "Dieses ist ursprünglich gewiss ein guter Gott, aber da die alte mandäische Spekulation die Weltschöpfung bald als ein Werk der guten, bald als eines der bösen Gewalten ersieht, so schwankt sein Charakterbild jetzt in der Geschichte".[2] The two views are evidently mutually exclusive.

With respect to the name Ptahil, a similar diversity of opinion exists. Since the days of Norberg, whose etymological enterprises were for the most part exceedingly unhappy, and up to the days of

[1] *Die mandäische Religion*, Leipzig, 1889, pp. 35-37, 49-55.

[2] *Protestantische Realencyklopädie*, 3 ed., article: Mandäer, vol. XII, 1903, p. 166, 51-54.

Kessler, the name was interpreted as one of simple Aramaic origin, composed of the two elements פתאה and עיל, and signifying "God opened".[3] This etymology, simple as it is satisfying, meets with one difficulty, that of explaining why a creative agent of the evil or good order should be called "God opened", in other words what may be the relation of the deity's name to its character and function. Now it is of course well known that in the Mandaic dialect the verb פתאה = פְּתַח signifies "create".[4] The name might thus with equal propriety signify "God creates", which in application to a demiurge would be eminently fitting. But the use of פְּתַח in the sense of create is itself so unusual as to require explanation. Has it evolved from the use of the expression פְּתַח רֶחֶם? If so how can this expression be applicable to the creation of the cosmos? To these questions no answer has yet been given. The sense of the name Ptahil, where its Aramaic origin is assumed, thus remains obscure.

The difficulty which will be felt at this point has led Lidzbarski to conjecture that the name is not essentially Aramaic but a combination of *Ptaḥ*, the name of the Egyptian deity, and the word עיל or אֵל. The Egyptian *Ptaḥ*, originally a metalworker, later became the demiurge to the dwellers of the Nile valley. The Mandaic use of the word פְּתַח in the sense "create" he considers a modification of פְּתַח in the sense of "engrave", the transition being effected in connection with the change in the status of the god *Ptaḥ* from that of a metalworker to that of a creator.[5]

Two significant facts make it quite impossible to accept this ingenious interpretation. The first is that analogous Biblical names, one the name of a person פְּתַחְיָה "Yah has opened (the womb)",[6] the other the name of a valley יִפְתַּח־אֵל "God opens

---

[3] Norberg, *Codex Nasaraeus*, tome V, Onomasticon, 1817, sub voce; Kessler, op. cit., p. 166, 45-46.

[4] Cf. M. Lidzbarski, *Mandäische Liturgien*, Berlin, 1920, p. xxi. An instance will be found in the baptismal liturgy, p. 6, 5-6.

[5] *Das Johannesbuch der Mandäer*, vol. II, Giessen, 1915, p. xxvii, and *Mand. Lit.*, pp. xxi-xxii.

[6] 1. Chron. 24, 16; cf. M. Noth, *Die israelitischen Personennamen*, Stuttgart, 1928, p. 179.

(or makes wide)",[7] are both intelligible without recourse to such an hypothesis, and furnish an a priori likelihood of the Aramaic derivation. The second is that for the syncretistic period and particularly for the syncretists of Syria and Mesopotamia the Egyptian god *Ptaḥ* and the cosmogony which he represents were virtually of no significance. It is usually a Semitic figure, the Yahwe of the Old Testament or a fallen Sophia who is made responsible for creation in the later period. Recourse should therefore be taken to an Egyptian deity only when all other possibilities have been fully exhausted. Besides it is much more logical to explain the name Ptahil from the peculiar use of the verb פָּתַח, than to adopt the reverse course of procedure.

Facing the two questions, the answers to which have caused so much difficulty, we are inclined to believe that to answer the first (is Ptahil an evil deity?) without previously having answered the second (what is the significance of his name?) is impossible and methodologically incorrect.

What the Mandaic texts have to tell us about the origin of the plan of creation and about Ptahil's relation to the celestial powers subsequent to the performance of the act of creation is confusing and often quite contradictory. In books I and II of the Right Ginza the plan of creation is conceived by the supreme God, here called the King of Light.[8] In book III on the contrary it arises in the mind of the "second one", Joshamin, a power occupying as it were a lower level of the heavenly realms.[9] It owes its origin to the fact that Joshamin on his level does not possess the luxurious environment of which the supreme deity (here called "Life") can boast. In book I creation is actually effected either by the word of God himself,[10] or by his agent Gabriel Sh^{e}liḥa. In book III the plan is transferred to the mind of Joshamin's offspring, Abatur, and actually consummated by his son Ptahil. Ptahil's operations

[7] Joshua 19, 14, cf. Gen. 9, 27 יַפְתְּ אֱלֹהִים לְיֶפֶת.

[8] *Ginza, der Schatz oder das grosse Buch der Mandäer*, trans. by M. Lidzbarski, Göttingen, 1925, p. 14, 28 ff., p. 33, 1 ff.

[9] *Ginza*, p. 78, 25-28.

[10] *Ginza*, p. 15, 19-20: Der hohe Lichtkönig sprach das Wort aus, da entstand jegliches Ding durch sein Wort.

are here neither desired or approved by the supreme God,[11] and may possibly have been considered the result of a revolt.[12]

Ptahil's own relations to the celestial powers in the period subsequent to the act of creation are also described in contradictory terms. In one group of passages we are told that his creation, his house (the world), is taken from him, that he is fettered and imprisoned in one of the stars (the guardhouses of syncretism) until the world shall have passed away, and that a curtain is dropped to separate him from Abatur and the other heavenly powers.[13] In another group of passages we find that he has been forgiven his deed and has been appointed by the agents of the supreme deity to be its regent of the established world order.[14]

Orientalists, officials of state, and missionaries who have come into direct contact with the Mandeans in Mesopotamia are unanimous in declaring them monotheistic in their outlook at the present time and as far back as the seventeenth century.[15] From the fact that the sect survived the Mohammedan era its would appear likely that the Mandeans succeeded in being classed among the *dhimmi,* possibly as or of the Sabeans, from which it would seem to follow that they were at that time believed to share the true revelation and the monotheism belonging to it. From these facts and probabilities it can be and has been argued that those passages in which creation is consummated at the behest of the supreme God, and in which the demiurge is the authorized representative of the supreme god within the cosmic order, are the expressions of the Mandaic faith in the later period of its development. The corollary to this is that such sections of the Ginza as reflect a tension between Ptahil and the god "Life", or imply that creation was undesirable to the latter, represent the older, original Mandaic theology. Hence Ptahil is made out to be an evil demiurge.

Yet two difficulties arise which do not permit this line of argument to become utterly convincing. In the first place we have

---

[11] *Ginza,* p. 68, 7-8: Steige früher zur Welt herab, bevor die Uthras (a blanket name for all lesser heavenly beings) dahingehen und etwas tun das für uns hässlich und unschön, und dem Leben nicht recht . . . ist.

[12] Cf. the use of "aufrührerische Thron" to describe Joshamin *Ginza,* p. 76, 23.

[13] *Ginza,* p. 352, 21-36, p. 105, 11-18.

[14] *Ginza,* p. 359, 24-40, pp. 364-367.

[15] Brandt, *Mand. Rel.,* p. 56 gives a partial list of testimonies.

no guarantee that the dualism which has definitely affected the character of the Mandaic faith at one stage in its development, is actually to be associated with the ultimate origins of that faith. Conceivably the period of dualistic leanings might be a passing element in the evolution of a religion both the beginning and the later ends of which are monotheistic. In the second place the traditions to the effect that Ptahil is the son of a beneficent power Abatur are so strong, uniform and uncontradicted that it is difficult to think of him as essentially satanic even when his act of creation is described as unwelcome to the supreme deity. In character he approximates, at his worst, only the fallen angels or the revolting Lucifer, and not the demiurgic archons of Manicheism.

If it be difficult to explain the contradictions contained in the texts which tell about Ptahil's relation to the divine pleroma, by the assumption of a primitive dualism, it will be equally difficult to argue on *general* grounds that the Mandeans were originally monotheistic in their leanings and that as creator Ptahil thus belongs originally to the heavenly hierarchy. A thorough-going monotheism in the age of syncretism would be rather an unusual phenomenon. In distinction from others who have busied themselves in passing with the problem of the god Ptahil, we therefore choose to leave the question, is he an evil deity, unanswered for the moment, and to seek from the analysis of the name and its connotations an objective basis for the interpretation of his character.

The name Ptahil, though it has analogies in the פְּתַחְיָה and יִפְתַּח־אֵל of the old Testament previously referred to, is by no means common in the later era. Outside the Mandaic texts we have to date only one actual occurrence, namely in the *Diwan* of Rūba ben El 'Aḡḡāḡ in the passage:

. . . . . .

Und frägt mich aus, wie viele Jahr' ich alt sei?
Ich sprach: blieb ich am Leben, alt wie Hisl,
Oder so lang wie Nūh' zur Zeit Fiṭah'l's (فطاحل)
Als Felsen sich erweichten wie der Lehmstoff . . .[16]

[16] XLVI, 12-15, trans. by W. Ahlwardt, Berlin, 1904. Reference was first made to this passage by Brandt, *Mandäische Schriften*, Göttingen, 1893, p. 60, n. 3.

Clearly Fiṭahl is here the guardian deity or the heros eponymos of one of the ages of the world's history. This age marked by longevity, by the plasticity of the creative substance, and by Noah as one of its important personages, can scarcely be any other than the very first age of human and cosmic history. In the later Orient the eponymos of the paradisiacal age is usually Yima or Jamshid. It is therefore to be expected that Bousset, arguing from the Diwan of the Arabic poet, should suggest that the Mandean Ptahil is in fact none other than the Iranian Yima.[17] In support of this identification he adduces the observations that both Ptahil and Yima enter into relations with evil powers (*daevas*), and that both experience a fall from grace by reason of this relationship. To this we might add that both are expected to be the rulers of the faithful in the new paradise at the end of time.[18]

Interesting as the similarities between the two figures are, and ready as one must be to admit that the figure of Yima may secondarily have influenced that of Ptahil (the assimilation being the basis for the erudite substitution of Ptahil for Jamshid in the verse of the Arabic poet), it is difficult to believe that in Yima we have the clue to the origin of the Mandaic demiurge. Two observations need to be recorded in this connection. First, the figure of Yima furnishes no tangible basis for the assumption by Ptahil of a demiurgic rôle. Second the Iranian eponymos gives no explanation of the origin of the name Ptahil other than that contained in the unwarranted assumption that, by reason of his association with the early ages of the world, he could become a demiurge, and completely ignores the question how the verb פְּתַח ever came to be employed in the sense of "create". We are therefore inclined to dismiss the reference to Ptahil in Rūba ben El'Aḡḡāḡ as being of no primary importance for the problem of the origin and identity of the Mandaic demiurge, and thus return to the Mandaic texts themselves in seeking the solution of this problem.

The starting point for this search will necessarily be found in the narrative of Ptahil's evocation. Reported in the Ginza in the form of a prophecy and its fulfillment, the story goes:

---

[17] *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, Göttingen, 1907, pp. 356-358.

[18] For Ptahil cf. *Ginza*, p. 312, 5-6: Er wird König der Uthras genannt werden und die Herrschaft über den ganzen Stamm der Seelen erhalten.

> Es (das Leben) . . . offenbarte mir (Hibil) und sprach zu mir: Hibil, reiner Mana. Joshamin hat drei Söhne geschaffen. Einer von ihnen bewahrt das Nest seiner Eltern, einer wohnt bei seinem Vater, einer, jener Abathur, geht in jene Welt in der du gewesen bist. Er sieht sein Gesicht im schwarzen Wasser, und sein Abbild und Sohn wird ihm aus dem schwarzen Wasser gebildet.
>
> Als das Leben, mein Vater, so sprach, stand Abathur auf, öffnete das Tor, schaute in das schwarze Wasser, und in derselben Stunde wurde sein Abbild im schwarzen Wasser gebildet. Ptahil wurde gebildet und stieg zum Grenzort empor. Abathur sah prüfend Ptahil an und sprach zu seinem Sohne Ptahil: Komm, komm, Ptahil, du bist es den ich im schwarzen Wasser geschaut habe.[19]

At first glance it might appear as though this passage, taken by itself, would furnish the clue to the origin of the name Ptahil. His birth is here directly connected with the "opening" of the gate of heaven, through which Abatur looks out when evoking his son from the water. A number of considerations, some of them of fundamental importance in our estimation, require the rejection of this easy solution. The opening of the gate of heaven, for one thing, is a thoroughly commonplace act, endlessly repeated in the narratives of the Ginza, and one which by reason of its casual nature, would hardly be of sufficient significance to be made the basis of Ptahil's name. Nor is the act to which Ptahil owes his origin the first instance of the opening of the heavenly gate. In the very passage just quoted we are told that Hibil descended to the world of murky water, the reference being to his primordial conflict with the powers of darkness, a late form of the Tiamat myth, recorded in book V of the Ginza. This descent must also have been preceded by the opening of the gate of heaven. More important, in our estimation, is the consideration that the term פתיל employed in the name Ptahil and in the corresponding expression, "God opened", can hardly be applicable to Abatur, here designated as the father of the demiurge. Abatur distinctly belongs to the lower of the two levels of heavenly existence (he is the son of Joshamin), and to our knowledge פתיל is used only of

[19] *Ginza*, p. 173, 34-174, 6.

beings of the uppermost level (so Hibil and Shithil for instance). Finally, we are inclined to suppose that the person called Ptahil will hardly be the product of the act of opening, whatever that act may have been, but rather the opener himself.

Our interest in the passage dealing with the origin of Ptahil lies as yet entirely in the sphere of the information which it affords of the birth of divine beings generally. It is a fact, insufficiently regarded in the earlier discussions of the Mandean theology, that the evocation of divine beings here follows a very definite and precisely formulated process. The process may be described as one in which the paternal power takes his stand over or at a body of water, regards his image in the water, extends to it his right hand, grasps the right hand of the image which has of course moved toward the extended right hand of the mirrored person, calls to the image, and raises it up out of the water by the hand. In evidence of this fact we offer here, in addition to the statement about Ptahil's origin, only reference to the constancy of the image relationship between father and son among the members of the divine pleroma,[20] and a passage from the ninth book of the Right Ginza where the supreme deity directs its offspring:

> Auf, ziehet hinaus zum Piriawis-Jordan, und zu den Wogen des Wassers, ersinnet und rufet hervor einen Sohn. . . .
>
> Sie (his offspring) erhoben sich, zogen zum Piriawis-Jordan und zu den Wogen des Wassers hinaus, sie ersannen und riefen hervor den einzigen Sohn, dessen Gestalt nicht vergeht. . . .[21]

It is this process in which we have the basis for the whole of the Mandaic baptismal liturgy. The submergence of the neophyte in the water of baptism, the gesture of giving the right hand of Kushṭa, the conception of לאת לאופא, the use of the word קאימתא to describe the act of acceptance into the Mandaic community by baptism, and the interpretation of baptism as rebirth, are all motivated by the fact that baptism reënacts the evocation of divine

[20] Manda d'Haije the image of the god Life: *Ginza*, p. 177, 32, Hibil the image of his father: ibid., 152, 31. Cf. further the "Register" to Lidzbarski's translation of the Ginza *sub voce*: Abbild.

[21] *Ginza*, pp. 235, 34-236, 8.

beings, thus making it possible for the neophyte in baptism to become a partaker of the divine life and its blessings.

A later development in the conception of the evocation of divine beings has made the "image", which in the story of Ptahil's birth is still impersonal until it is raised from the water, the female *paredros* of the paternal deity and the mother of the evoked offspring.[22] In this form the conception is shared by the Koukeans of whom Bar Khoni tells. As translated by Pognon the account reads:

> Ils disent que Dieu . . . s'assit sur les eaux, les regarda et y vit sa propre image; qu'il étendit la main, la prit, en fit sa compagne, eut des rapports avec elle et engendra d'elle une foule de dieux et de déesses.[23]

The acceptance by the Mandeans, and by the Koukeans as well, of this particular view of the evocation of divine beings will hardly be entirely fortuitous. Unique conceptions such as this are usually rooted in some premise of the whole system and it is in endeavoring to follow through to the ultimate premises of the doctrine that we find an answer to the question of the origin and significance of the name and the figure of Ptahil.

Bar Khoni in the earlier part of his narrative concerning the Koukeans, a part not previously quoted here, gives the ultimate premise of the conception of divine evocation held in these circles. He says:

> Ils disent que Dieu naquit de la mer située dans la terre de lumière, qu'ils appellent la mer éveillée . . . et que la mer de lumière et la terre sont plus anciennes que Dieu; que lorsque Dieu naquit de la mer éveillée il s'assit sur les eaux . . .[24]

The theogony to which reference is here made by Bar Khoni was at one time held by the Mandeans. Some traces of it are still to be found in the Ginza and in the Mandaic liturgies. Two pas-

[22] So Dmuth-Haije is the mother of Joshamin, *Ginza*, p. 290, 25.

[23] *Inscriptions mandaites des Coupes de Khouabir*, Paris, 1898, pp. 209-210, Syriac text p. 144. The narrative of course recalls the story of the creation of man in tract I of the Corpus Hermeticum, cf. my *Anthropos and Son of Man*, New York, 1927, pp. 44-45.

[24] Ibid., then follows the remainder of the passage as quoted above.

sages are of particular significance in this connection. Both speak of the supreme deity as "Life", a term possibly strange at first glance, yet fully established in its application.[25] The first of these passages reads:

> Die grosse Frucht entstand,
> und in ihr der Jordan.
> Der grosse Jordan entstand,
> und es entstand das lebende Wasser.
> Es entstand das glänzende, prangende Wasser.
> und aus dem lebenden Wasser bin ich, das Leben, entstanden.
> Ich, das Leben entstand,
> und alsdann entstanden alle Uthras.[26]

The statement contained in this passage is in the main intelligible without further comment. The supreme deity is born from the heavenly Jordan, the river which flows through heaven, the one from which all other heavenly beings are produced and the one in the lower terrestrial reaches of which the faithful are baptized. The one obscure element of the passage is the reference to the fact that the Jordan comes from the great "fruit" פירא. This requires elucidation by reference to the second of the two important passages bearing upon the theogony. This second passage reads:

> Pirjawis, der grosse Jordan des ersten Lebens, der ganz Heilungen ist, flammt wie Glanz im Tanna (תאנא). Als das Leben flammte, als das Leben emporkam durch den grossen Glanz, der darin flammt, stieg das Leben empor und gründete eine Shkina über dem Tanna. Der Glanz erhitzte sich, und das Tanna schmolz. Wasser wurde geschaffen und das Leben fand Bestand" (אחקאיאם חייא) in seinem eignen Wasser. . . . Das Leben stellte das Leben (itself?) im Wasser auf. . . .[27]

This passage contains some rather obscure elements, yet it undoubtedly refers to the same event to which the Ginza passage previously quoted refers, namely the moment of the emergence of

[25] Brandt, *Mand. Rel.*, p. 17; Kessler, op. cit., p. 164.
[26] *Ginza*, p. 73, 19-26.
[27] *Mand. Lit.*, p. 25, 5-11.

the deity "Life" from the waters of the heavenly Jordan. It adds to the previous passage the detail that the Jordan comes from, or represents in a molten form, the Tanna within which were originally contained "splendor" זיוא (an effulgence or radiance like the divine δόξα or hvarēna) and the deity Life itself. The important point for us in this context is the meaning of the word תאנא, analogous in the present passage to the פירא of the previous one. The word itself is not found, to our knowledge, outside of Mandaic writ. Lidzbarski's attempt to explain it as an abbreviation of תְּנוּרָא is most certainly wrong.[28] One would normally suppose it to be a noun formed by the use of the prefix ת [29] from the common root אנה. It would in this case be analogous with Mandaic מאנא, and like it would signify a vessel or container. How the oriental imagination came to call this "container" within which there existed the germ or seed of "Life" a fruit, will not be difficult to comprehend.

Now it is our conjecture that this "container" or "fruit", from which the supreme deity and the heavenly Jordan emerged, represents the cosmic egg well known from the oriental theogonies of Eudemus and Mochos and from the orphic theogony, all reported by Damascius.[30] The arguments which may be advanced in favor of this hypothesis include among others the following: (1) The word הילבונא literally "white of egg", but in the Mandaic dialect the egg itself, is frequently used by the Mandeans to denote the place from which heavenly beings arise and in which they live.[31] This is probably a reminiscence of the fact that the supreme deity originally proceeded from an egg. The basis for the extension of this idea will become apparent shortly. (2) One passage of the Ginza actually makes הילבונא and תאנא synonymous. Here Manda d'Haije declares to the supreme heavenly powers:

> Ich will mich aufmachen und den Schatzhalter, euren Sohn, jene Pflanze, die ihr gepflanzet, das Abbild, das ihr gebildet habt aus eurem Versteck, eurem Ei, aus jenem

[28] *Mand. Lit.*, p. 19, n. 3.

[29] For nouns formed in this way in the Mandean dialect cf. *Nöldeke, Mandäische Grammatik*, Halle, 1875, pp. 133-134.

[30] *De principiis*, cc. 123, 125, ed. Kopp, pp. 380, 385.

[31] This fact has already brought itself to the attention of Lidzbarski, *Johannesbuch*, vol. II, p. 208, n. 7.

> Jordan, den ihr hingezogen . . . , aus dem Tanna und der Ader eures Ortes rufen.[32]

(3) The imagery of the theogony which speaks of the presence in the "container" of ויוא "splendor" and of the fluid which becomes the heavenly Jordan, a stream of "white water",[33] recalls nothing so much as the yolk and the white of an egg. We assume in this connection that the Mandaic use of היולבונא for the egg proper derives from the fact that the deity, representing the ויוא or yolk, actually emerges through the "white waters" of the Jordan, which become the egg per se as pars pro toto. Since all later evocations in the divine pleroma are also produced from the Jordan, it is possible to see how they can be said to come from היולבוניא also.

Two conclusions, both of them contributing extensively to the clarification of the confusion which has obtained with respect to the original constitution of the divine pleroma and the nature of the process of creation in Mandaic theology, naturally follow when we postulate at one step in the development of the Mandaic faith the acceptance of this theogony. The first is that to the pleroma associated with our theogony belong only the supreme god "Life", Manda d'Haije (his hypostatic reason), Kushṭa (truth as the directive force of his reason and his actions), and the Uthras (the angels, literally, the riches of his wisdom or reason). Other heavenly beings have been introduced into this hierarchy to reconcile it with the beliefs current in earlier or later stages of the development of the Mandean faith. So the Hibil-Shithil-Anosh group, together with Joshamin have been introduced into the hierarchy to coördinate it with a prior, Palestinian stage in Mandaic development, and Abatur, literally "the man with the scales", and none other than the Iranian Rashnu, to accommodate it to the subsequent Iranian influence.[34] The second conclusion is that the whole of the process of cosmogony is but the continuation of the process begun in the theogony, and that it consists of the mingling of the two heavenly elements "radiance" and "water", released by the opening of the egg, with the analogous elements

---

[32] *Ginza*, p. 150, ult.-151, 4.

[33] *Ginza*, p. 12, 15-16: Die Jordane der Lichwelten sind voll weissen Wassers.

[34] For the etymology of Abatur cf. Lidzbarski, *Johannesbuch*, II, p. xxix.

contained in the "burning water" of the foul primordial deep. And, as the downward flow of the heavenly Jordan, once it has been released from the egg, and the ubiquitous radiation of the heavenly "brilliance" are of themselves automatic, so the whole process of their mingling with the elements of the deep and the consequent formation of the cosmic order are virtually automatic. It is only the creation of man in which the divine reason plays a special part.[35]

These conclusions, if for the moment they be accepted, and of the utmost importance in explaining the Mandaic use of פְּתַח in the sense of "create" and in clarifying the origin of the god Ptahil. In the days when the theogony with which we have concerned ourselves was an element of the living faith of the Mandeans, there was one and only one act of "opening" sufficiently important to affect the vocabulary and nomenclature employed by the sect. This was the opening of the תאנא. But the opening of תאנא was eo ipso also the beginning of the process of creation, the creation of the heavenly hierarchy and of the cosmic system. On this basis we can understand how פְּתַח "to open" came to be used in the sense of "create". The deity associated with the process of creation under the name "God opened" can then *originally* have been none other than the supreme god himself, who opened the egg and issued forth from it thereby giving a beginning to the process of cosmogony. Ptahil in his original form, is then the supreme deity in his particular function as creator, a beneficent and not an evil power.

It is a far cry from the earliest, postulated use of the name Ptahil as a functional reference to the supreme god, to the demiurge Ptahil of the existing Mandaic texts. Yet if we take into account the facts that have been established and the streams of dualistic influence playing upon the Mandeans in their later Mesopotamian environment, the changes that have come about will become entirely intelligible. Dualism demands that the creator and the supreme deity be differentiated. By transforming the modalistic Ptahil into a separate hypostasis and moving this hypostasis as far down the line of evocation as possible, the older monotheism

[35] Extended proof of the validity of these conclusions which space does not permit me to present here, I hope to offer in a subsequent publication.

was accommodated to the needs of a later period. Where the traditions telling about the acceptibility of Ptahil's creation and about his subsequent relations to deity fluctuate, we see the later Mandeans endeavoring simultaneously to copy the dualistic stories of the fettered archons of Manicheism, and to preserve the continuity of their own traditional religious belief.

One particular item, that of Ptahil's subsequent relationship, as son, to Abatur requires additional explanation. According to all the canons of dualism, Ptahil as demiurge belongs outside the actual boundary line of the pleroma during the process of creation and during the era of cosmic existence. This fact was given to begin with. On the other hand Abatur, the Iranian Rashnu, belongs at the very portal of the heavenly world. In the Iranian traditions he sits at the Činvat bridge weighing the souls of the departed in the balance and admitting the faithful to the spiritual world. What is more natural under the conditions obtaining in a dualistic environment, than that Abatur as the one nearest the outer extremities of the divine realm, should be placed in an immediate and personal relationship to the demiurge who normally ranks highest in the order of those powers within the cosmic realm. The collocation made simple the transition from the world of existence to the world of causation, a transition which proved so difficult to all those who like the Gnostics seriously concerned themselves with the problem of evil. That the origin of Ptahil as the son of Abatur was described in the text quoted above, in terms of the process of evocation connected with the old theogony is a fact for which we must be grateful, for it gives us the clue to the ultimate origin, identity, and significance of the figure.

BRIEF NOTE

Addendum on the *Record of Darius's Palace at Susa*

In connection with the text of the *Record,* as published by me in this JOURNAL 53. 1-23, É. Benveniste of Paris writes that Scheil has received an additional fragment which establishes the reading *naucaina* in lines 30-1, rather than *nauzaina.* The latter reading is therefore definitely to be rejected. *Naucaina,* he emphasizes, means "of the nature of the pine."

Benveniste, in the same letter, rejects König's equation *θa-ra-mi-i-ša* in 30 with Greek τέρμινθος, and adopts Herzfeld's *θarmiš* = Acc. *surmēnu.* He normalizes *a-ra-ja-na-ma* as *ārañjanam* 'ornament, carving', and takes it from *rang-, ranǰ-,* cf. Mod. Pers. *rānǰ,* etc.

ROLAND G. KENT.

University of Pennsylvania.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Das Alphabet von Ras Schamra: seine Entzifferung und seine Gestalt. Mit drei Anhängen. Von HANS BAUER. Halle/Saale: MAX NIEMEYER VERLAG, 1932. Pp. 2 + 76.

The distinguished pioneer in the decipherment of the Ras Shamra texts in alphabetic cuneiform script (in his *Entzifferung der Keilschrifttafeln von Ras Schamra,* 1930) presents in this monograph a collection of various detail studies upon those texts; he takes position cautiously, eschewing translations at length, and we are indebted to him for a valuable lot of philological collectanea. He draws his statistical material almost entirely from the small tablets published by Virolleaud in 1929 (*Syria,* X, pl. 4), with only partial reference to the first fragments of the Epic published in 1931, to which texts Appendix III, pp. 64-70, presents some "grundsätzliche Anmerkungen", while the latest find of further epical material (*Syria,* 1932, pl. 2) came too late for his consideration. The fast growing amount of material tends promptly to antiquate current discussions, but these are of permanent value when they pursue careful philological method, such as characterizes all of Bauer's work. Pp. 1-17 are devoted to explanation and defence of the "method" he employed in his determination of the consonants of the new alphabet, along with acknowledgment of the cases wherein he was misled. Appendix I, pp. 41-56, offers a chronological table of the facts and documents pertaining to the discovery and decipherment from May, 1929, to January, 1932; this includes summaries and some citations at length of the various discussions. Such a presentation was felt by the author to be necessary, as in one quarter his own valuable contribution to the decipherment has been ignored. Pp. 18-39 consist of lists supporting the identifications of distinct signs for *ḫ* and *ḥ*, for the several sibilants, *s*, *š* and the representative of Arabic *ṯ*, and for the three signs for 𐎀, which vary according to the coloration of the attendant vowel, although the distinctions have not yet been exactly diagnosed; the notes on these phenomena are valuable. Partial transliterations, with notes, are given for the small tablets in App. II, pp. 59-63, while their subject matter is briefly discussed, pp.

36-39. A study of the divine names Mōt and Baʿal, pp. 71-74, is very suggestive; for the presence of Mōt in the Biblical nomenclature he has been anticipated by the late Professor Paton. Bauer would relate *mōt* ultimately to the element *mut* found in Methushael, etc. (he parallels *šem, sĕmū, šūm*). From the phrase in the later texts בעל עז, "Baal the mighty", he would interpret the Biblical name of the Solomonic pillar and the n. pr. בעז. For comparison the reviewer may note the number of place-names containing this element in disguise in the Lebanon, e. g., Baʿabda, Baʿaḳlīn, probably Brummānā.[1] On pp. 74-76 are cited a number of examples illustrating the principle that "in a word with a labial an emphatic may be reduced to a non-emphatic".

The monograph appears to have been built up with various accretions, and the reviewer has attempted an orderly analysis of its contents. A discussion of importance is given, pp. 66 ff., on the tenses in our dialect—the Safonian, as Bauer proposes to call it; one of the problems in the texts is the constant use of the verbal imperfect for historic time, and Bauer moots the question whether typical *yḳṭl* may not equally represent *yaḳṭul* and *yaḳaṭal*, as with the Akkadian tenses. In regard to phonetic details he cites several unsolved problems, e. g. Heb. בקש, שלחן, שפט written with שׂ, Arab. *ṯ*; cf. also the transcriptions for שש and שרש, "six", p. 23. It appears that the Saphonian scribes had not attained philological accuracy in their phonetic representations, and discount against their spellings must be allowed on this score. That their work had by no means reached a schooled perfection appears from the large number of obvious errors in the texts. For many points which Bauer touches upon, and for others in which elucidation is attempted, I refer to some *Notes* of mine on those texts to appear shortly in these columns. I may note here that for ים "day", as a god, as argued by Bauer, p. 37, he might well have adduced the new Aramaic inscription from Sudschin, so brilliantly interpreted by him, in which, Aa, 12, Day is one of a series of deities invoked. Also in connection with Ṣapon (p. 37) may be noted its theophorous use in Hebrew and Phoenician names, e. g. צפניה.

James A. Montgomery.

University of Pennsylvania.

[1] The first syllable may represent *beit* in some instances.

Études sur les Origines de la Religion de l'Égypte. Par Samuel A. B. Mercer. London: Luzac, 1929. Pp. xi + 105.

The difficulty of penetrating to the ethnic or religious origins of a country like Egypt are very great. The researches of the Oriental Institute of Chicago have shown that man has inhabited the Nile Valley for something like 100,000 years. During that time, race has been imposed upon race, each bringing with it its religious conceptions. In the brochure before us, Prof. Mercer has made an attempt to explore those far-off ages. He discusses in successive chapters "Egypt before the Period of the Pyramid Texts," and each of the gods Horus, Seth, Osiris, and Re before the Pyramid Texts, concluding his work with a chapter on the origin of the Egyptian religion. The book was published in 1929, but Prof. Mercer had published a brief study of the same subject in the April number of the *Journal of the Society of Oriental Research* for 1928.

The book bears upon every page the stamp of wide reading and thoughtful scholarship. In the sketch of Egypt in the first chapter, Prof. Mercer has made use of all the recent researches which throw light on the subject including the publications of Brunton on "The Badarian Civilisation" and Sanford and Arkel's investigations of the Fayum. Prof. Mercer's thesis is that the god Horus, the falcon god, was the most ancient god of historic Egypt and of the first Pharaohs; that Seth was the god of the indigeous Egyptians, that Osiris was probably introduced from Asia, and that Re was the god of the Armenoid or Alpine people who invaded Egypt and settled at Heliopolis.

The work of Prof. Mercer is very suggestive and in groping for the truth where the evidences are so slight every hypothesis should be sympathetically considered. In the judgment of the reviewer, the origin of the Egyptian religion cannot be discovered by a process as simple as that which Prof. Mercer has followed. The method pursued by Prof. Sethe in his *Urgeschichte und älteste Religion der Ägypter* (Leipzig, 1930), seems to the reviewer to be more scientific and to lead to far more probable results. Prof. Sethe takes the names as units and also applies to each name knowledge gained from the study of anthropology, but reaches quite different conclusions.

The reviewer has for some years been working on the subject and his results will be presented in his forth-coming *Semitic and Hamitic Origins*. While it is true that the four deities treated by Prof. Mercer assumed in Egyptian history shortly before the dynastic period an important rôle, the real beginnings were, in the reviewer's judgment, far different. The hawk was not, in the reviewer's opinion, at the beginning a single deity but the totem of several tribes each of which originally worshipped different spirits. These tribes pictured their deity by this totem and ultimately, after writing was invented, *ḥr*, the name of the totem, came to designate the deity; thus in nomes settled by tribes whose totem was the hawk, Horus appeared to be worshipped. The reviewer mentions this simply as an example of the way in which in his judgment one can discern beginnings that lay considerably farther back than Prof. Mercer penetrates. He agrees, however, with Prof. Mercer that Osiris and Isis were of Asiatic origin; he would go farther and say specifically, of Semitic origin for which he believes to have etymological grounds.

We welcome, however, Prof. Mercer's book. Doubtless had Prof. Sethe's work been published before his own, Prof. Mercer would have taken advantage of the researches of the German scholar and written somewhat differently.

George A. Barton.

University of Pennsylvania.

Woodbrooke Studies, Vol. III: 1. *Vision of Theophilus*; 2. *Apocalypse of Peter*; Vol. V: *Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Nicene Creed*. By A. Mingana. Cambridge: Heffer & Sons, 1931, 1932.

The first document in Vol. III, namely the Vision of Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria (385-412), is only a section of an apocryphal work in six books on the life of the Virgin and her Son. This vision relates the flight of the Holy Family into Egypt, the sojourn of Jesus, Mary, Joseph, and Salome on the mountain of Ḳusḳam, and the consecration of the house, in which they had dwelt, as a church. Although, according to the text, the story was related to Theophilus by the Virgin herself (p. 40), and written down by

St. Cyril as he had heard it from the same Theophilus, his predecessor (p. 42), Mingana is of the opinion that it is the work of a late Coptic bishop of the eleventh century who wrote it in Arabic. It seems indeed very probable that the Syriac text is a translation of an Arabic original, for, as the editor points out, there are in the text distinct Arabic words and many Arabic expressions altogether foreign to the Syriac language. The striking examples, noted by Mingana (pp. 4-6), prove this beyond doubt. To these may be added the strange locution found, p. 67, l. 19: *Hā batᵉrēn lesṭāiē*, "Behold the two robbers", where the use of *hā* followed by the preposition *b* is evidently a literal rendering of the Arabic *'idhā bi*. The Syriac text, here reproduced, is that of Mingana Syr. 48 with variants from Mingana Syr. 5 and Borgiano siriaco 128, now in the Vatican Library. There are also two Garshūni MSS of the story, Mingana Syr. 39 and Mingana Syr. 114, but no use has been made of them for they do not contribute anything of importance. The English translation is very good and reads well. Some of the renderings, however, may be slightly emended. P. 45, l. 18: *Šᵉrā:* "he dwelt" instead of "he came down". P. 46, l. 16: translate: "which is interpreted, Our God with us", after the reading of the Peshiṭṭa. P. 52, l. 3: the Pa'el *ḥaqqar* is "to honor" rather than "to praise". P. 60, l. 1: the following sentence is omitted: "but let it (the water) be bitter in the mouths of the inhabitants of the city". P. 62, l. 12: translate: "all those who stammer, or are dumb or deaf". P. 76, l. 12: *kāphōrē* is "infidels", not "cruel men". P. 79, l. 9: instead of *nenoḥ* we would expect *nīnaḥ* from *'enaḥ* ("to wail"); but perhaps *nenoḥ*, which in Syriac means "he ceases" or "he is quiet", is used here for the Arabic *nāḥa* ("to wail"). Line 15: *ḥaiiel(i) lebbekh(i)*: render: "Comfort thy heart", or "Be of good cheer", not: "Receive power from me", which is an oversight, for the same expression on the next page, l. 3, is translated correctly. P. 79, last line: translate: "your weeping, your anguish and your trouble have reached my heart".

The second document is an Apocalypse of Peter, called in some MSS the Book of the Rolls, a title which seems more appropriate. It is another recension of a work attributed to Clement and has nothing in common with the ancient Greek Apocalypse of Peter. Mingana considers it a *mixtum compositum*, consisting of different layers, the oldest of which he would assign to about A. D. 800.

By processes of addition and subtraction the work would have assumed its present form during the fourteenth century. The Garshūni text in this edition is that of Mingana Syr. 70. Mingana did not think it necessary to include the first 52 folios as this part has been edited and translated by Mrs. Gibson from a similar MS (*Studia Sinaitica,* VIII). The folios reproduced in facsimile are 53b-81, 81-115, 155b-187. All these are translated in full; the rest are partly analyzed and partly translated. The translation of the work was a very difficult task for the Garshūni text was made after an Arabic MS in which many diacritical points had been omitted, and congratulations are due Mingana, one of our best Arabic scholars, for giving us a thoroughly reliable interpretation of this strange Apocalypse.

Vol. V of the *Woodbrooke Studies* contains the Syriac text and English translation of a hitherto lost work of Theodore of Mopsuestia, the Commentary on the Nicene Creed, often referred to in patristic literature as the *Liber ad baptizandos.* Only a few quotations from this important treatise were known; they are found in the Latin version of the Acts of the Fifth Oecumenical Council (553), in the synodal letter of Pope Pelagius, in the writings of Facundus, and in those of Marius Mercator. All those quotations are given in this edition (pp. 8-16). The Syriac text of this famous commentary is that of the unique MS, Mingana Syr. 561. As this MS is not in a good state of preservation, Mingana has not given a photographic reproduction of it, as he has done in the case of other unique texts, but has copied it and edited it in the ordinary Syriac serṭo which is more familiar to students. The translation is worthy of all praise. Syriac versions of Greek philosophical and theological works present many difficulties, even to the best interpreters; in this case the translator has performed the delicate task with great skill and judgment. We have noticed only a few instances in which the translation may be somewhat modified. P. 117, l. 21: read: "the wisdom that was hidden in Him." P. 118, l. 23: instead of *bᵉkhol,* read *khol.* P. 120, l. 19: we would suggest *qᵉdhāmaiṇ* "before us", and render: "We hope to go to heaven where Christ went before us on our behalf". P. 134, l. 7: translate: To this "Creator" they added "of all things visible and invisible"; l. 14: *haw* seems correct; then translate: "because He, who is said to be His Son, is of the same nature". P. 135, l. 8: *mawdāiṯū* here, we believe, has the meaning "to con-

fess", and we would translate: "We must, therefore, confess two things of God: that He is Father, and that He is also Creator." P. 141, l. 5: read: "And His humanity also is confessed in which the divine nature was made known and proclaimed". P. 147, l. 18: *Ellā* here means "but": "And to show that He was with God, not from outside as something foreign, *but* from the very nature of the divinity". P. 160, l. 24: *Bᵉnaiṇāšā*: in this passage, and wherever this sentence of the Nicene Creed is quoted, read "men", not "children of men", in order to include Adam and Eve to whom *barnāšā* in the strict sense of "child of man" does not apply; the words of the original Greek, δι' ἡμᾶς ἀνθρώπους, refer to all men without exception. P. 177, l. 5: *Nafšeh sarreq*: we would prefer the common rendering: "He emptied Himself".

Students of Oriental languages will welcome the splendid edition of this treatise which many thought lost for ever. It is a unique contribution to the theology of Theodore of Mopsuestia, whom the Nestorian Syrians regard as the Interpreter *par excellence*, and to the history of the Christological controversies in the fifth century. The two documents in Vol. III are also of great importance. The *Vision of Theophilus* completes other apocrypha published by Wright, Budge, and Mrs. Lewis, and the *Apocalypse of Peter* adds much to our knowledge of the so-called Clementine literature. The photographic reproduction of the major part of the Garshūni text of this Apocalypse is very interesting from a paleographical standpoint; from it alone the student may easily learn at first hand how the Syrians, with their twenty-two letters and a few diacritical signs, managed to transliterate into their own script the twenty-eight characters of the Arabic alphabet.

A. Vaschalde.

Catholic University of America.

Studies in Early Mysticism in the Near and Middle East. By Margaret Smith, M. A., Ph. D. London: The Sheldon Press. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1931. Pp. x + 276.

In this volume the author has presented in a careful study the teachings of early Christian and early Muhammedan mysticism.

The book is divided in two parts, the first of which deals with early Christian asceticism and mysticism, while the second part has as its subject the origin and development of Islamic mysticism as represented by early Ṣūfism. Chapter X is devoted to a more detailed treatment of the teachings of four of the leading early mystics, *viz.*, Rābi'a al-'Adawiyya of Baṣra (A. D. 717-801); Ḥārith al-Muḥāsibī (781-857); Dhū al-Nū al-Nūn al-Miṣri (*ob.* 860) and Abū Yazīd Biṣṭāmī (*ob.* 875).

In this interesting study of early Ṣūfism we have once again the clear demonstration that the deep things of God are not the prerogative of any one creed or nation, but are scattered over the whole field of humanity. One might look upon the various forms and teachings of early mysticism, Christian and Ṣūfi, regarding them collectively, as a string of pearls of different sizes, hence of different values, each radiating its own inner light for the spiritual illumination of all those who have seeing eyes and an understanding heart. The unveiling of the Holy Grail can only be performed by the "Guileless Fool."

Whatever one's creed, the spiritually minded man cannot fail to be deeply impressed by the mystic teaching of the early Ṣūfīs, by their constant demand for purity of thought, purity of life, self-discipline, repentance, and personal holiness, without which God can neither be seen nor the soul receive that divine illumination which is the goal of the quest on which the mystic has embarked. The fact that the roots of Ṣūfism probably go back, at least in the main, to the teaching of the early Oriental Christian mystics (p. 254) detracts in no way from its importance as a great spiritual movement in Islām. It is well to remember that early Ṣūfism taught these noble ideals long before the Christian Church in the West had its recognized mystics.

The time is past when Muhammad's teachings were attributed to the inspiration of Satan, even by scholars, but, unfortunately, one hears it still too often said, in a deprecatory manner in allusion to Muhammadanism, "by their fruits ye shall know them." It is quite true that there are in Islām some serious shortcomings. Muhammad himself did not continue to live upon the exalted plane for the pure and lofty aspirations of the earlier years of his ministry. Yet we must not forget that, although Ṣūfism is not a direct fruit of Islām, it helped to produce these deply spiritual teachers,

both men and women, who experienced in their own souls what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height of God's revelation to the humble heart.

Dr. Smith has rendered a great service to all those who are interested in the spiritual things of life by presenting in a lucid manner the tenets of mysticism as voiced by the early Oriental Christian and early Ṣūfī mystics. Although the book is written for the general, educated public, it is the work of a scholar, who has not only a thorough knowledge, but also a sympathetic understanding of the subject. Students of Oriental mysticism will welcome it as a distinct contribution toward a just valuation of this important movement in Islām. As the author quotes freely from her Oriental sources, and sometimes gives extensive excerpts, no specialist knowledge is required to enjoy fully the reading of this well written book. It should be of special interest to the clergy of every creed to whom the mysteries of God's dealings with mankind are not limited to what may be found between the covers of any particular volume. A good Index and Bibliography add greatly to the usefulness of the book, and to the further study of this important and exceedingly interesting subject.

Comparative Tables of Muhammadan and Christian Dates. By Lt.-Colonel Sir Wolseley Haig. London, 1932. Pp. 31

This booklet seems to be the well known *Vergleichungs-Tabellen,* by Wüstenfeld-Mahler, split up into its component parts, thereby making three Tables out of one. While the Vergleichungs-Tabellen give at a glance the desired date, even the day of the week, the use of Haig's Comparative Tables requires an elaborate calculation involving reference to all three Tables. The explanation, given by the author, of how to find the date in the Christian era corresponding to Ramadan 5 A. H. 966, requires no less than 12 printed lines (p. 4). All this calculation one would have expected the author to make and to embody its results in his Tables, which would thereby have been reduced to one Table, giving the complete data. In view of the excellent and complete *Vergleichungs-Tabellen* there appears to be no excuse for the publication of these *Comparative Tables.*

H. Henry Spoer.

New York City.

Josephus the Man and the Historian. By H. St. John Thackeray with a preface by George Foot Moore. The Hilda Stich Strook Lectures. New York: Jewish Institute of Religion Press, 1929. Pp. ix + 160.

This volume by the late H. St. John Thackeray is a model of thorough scholarship and literary excellence. As translator of Josephus for the Loeb Classical Library and as author of a concordantial "Lexicon of the Greek 'Josephus'," now in the process of publication by the Kohut Foundation, Thackeray brings to this work an unexcelled knowledge of the subject, and offers a convenient summary of his conclusions in a masterful form.

In the first lecture on the life and character of Josephus, Thackeray has no easy task in furnishing a balanced estimate of his hero. Josephus suffers from too many defects to be counted among the noble sons of his race. Thackeray recognizes his egotism, self-centeredness, and flattery of his Roman patrons, but seeks to demonstrate also some of his sterling merits. Contrary to the general view, Thackeray thinks that Josephus "has surely earned the name patriot", largely because of his service to the Jewish people as historian and apologete. This claim is justified only on the ground of the *Antiquities* and *Contra Apionem*, but not by the *Jewish War*. In his penetrating lecture on the Jewish War, Thackeray himself accepts Laquer's opinion that it was written at the order of the Roman conquerors for propagandist purposes and exhibits throughout the Roman point of view. The original Aramaic edition was prepared for eastern readers in order to demonstrate to the vanquished Jews and to other nations, like the Parthians, the futility of revolts against Rome. The first Greek draft, the *Halosis*, was perhaps issued in time for the imperial triumph in 71. The more elaborate edition, the *Polemos*, appeared during the reign of Domitian. Its chief source were the Latin "memoirs" or "commentaries" of the Roman commanders, Vespasian and Titus. They seem to have been utilized also by Tacitus in the fifth book of his Histories, and form the basis of Books III-VI of the *War*. The story of the pre-war period was compiled from the writings of Nikolaos of Damascus and from official documents preserved in Rome.

Though enjoying as unusual a combination of opportunities for presenting an accurate report as has fallen to few war historians

of either ancient or modern times, Josephus failed to reach the highest standard. He lacks the sober impartiality of a Thucydides, and shows insufficient regard for truth. He views the campaign through Roman spectacles, lavishes undue praise upon his patron, Titus, and misrepresents details in order to ingratiate himself with his other patron, King Agrippa II. However, though one-sided, the *War* "in its main outline must be accepted as trustworthy. Considered as a work of art, it takes high rank in literature." If in the *Jewish War* Josephus offended the susceptibilities of his Jewish brethren, he set out to make amends in his *Jewish Antiquities*, by showing that the Jews had a history comparable, and as regards antiquity superior, to that of their conquerors. In this work Thackeray recognizes a counterpart to the *Roman Antiquities* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, written a century earlier, also in twenty books. Dionysius is the immediate model of Josephus not only in the general plan of the work but also in the treatment of numerous details. The invaluable state papers, in the latter half of the *Antiquities*, were sent up to Rome from the various provinces at the order of Vespasian when he undertook to restore the Roman Capitol, which with its library had been ruined in the conflicts of the year 69. The provincial officers probably returned all the instructions which were received from Roman governors. In Rome they were inspected and copied or rather translated by one of the author's able assistants.

The lecture on "Josephus and Judaism" is concerned chiefly with the Biblical text employed by the historian. Thackeray traces at least two texts, one in a Semitic language, the other in Greek. The Semitic text served as his main authority throughout the Pentateuch, the Septuagint being used but slightly. From Samuel to I Maccabees the position is reversed. The basis is the Greek Bible and the Semitic is only a subsidiary source. For the books of Joshua, Judges, and Ruth, Thackeray finds no certain evidence of the use of a Greek text. As between Hebrew and Aramaic, he suspects in Judges at least dependence on a Targum. The Greek text uniformly utilized by Josephus is the Lucianic or pre-Lucianic recension.

Strikingly original is the lecture on "Josephus and Hellenism." Here Thackeray goes out in quest of the unacknowledged literary assistants of Josephus, who not only polished his periods but also composed large portions of the narrative. Thackeray detects in

Books XV and XVI of the *Antiquities* the marks of an assistant of fine literary taste, as was the case with the *War,* while in Books XVII-XIX he finds "the idiosyncracies and pedantic tricks of a hack, an imitator of Thucydides."

The last lecture deals with "Josephus and Christianity." The allusions to Christian beginnings in Antiquities XVIII, 5, 2 (116-119) and XX, 9, 1 (197-203) and the *testimonium Flavianum* regarding Jesus in XVIII, 3, 3 (63-64) are treated with utmost care and restraint. On the problem of the relation of the Slavonic version of the war to the lost Aramaic original and of its references to Christianity Thackeray suspends judgment. While directing his readers to Dr. Eisler's work on the subject, he adds that much as he learned from Eisler, he is far from being converted to all of his revolutionary views.

"The lectures as a whole", as George Foot Moore remarks in his preface, "are a notable contribution to the subject with which they deal." From a master like Thackeray additional light would have been most welcome on the Judaism of Josephus and on the Hellenistic coloring of his treatment of Jewish history and religion.

Samuel S. Cohon.

Hebrew Union College.

Sardis, VII, 1: *Greek and Latin Inscriptions.* By W. H. Buckler and D. M. Robinson. Leyden: 1932. 4to. Pp. ii + 198, with XIII plates and 212 figures in the text.

Volume VI, 1 and 2, of the Publications of the American Society for the Excavation of Sardis, *Lydian Inscriptions,* by E. Littmann and others, was published in 1916 and 1924. Now Pt. 1 of the long delayed corpus of Greek and Roman inscriptions has appeared, made possible in part by a grant from the American Council of Learned Societies.

The work treats 231 inscriptions—serial Nos. 1-228—ranging in date from the fifth century B. C. (102) to the tenth or eleventh A. D. (176). Of these 106 had already been published, six of which are now re-edited in complete form, while twenty-five others are based on new copies. Since many inscribed stones collected in the "Museum" at Sardis during the excavations in and around the Temple of Artemis in 1910-14 and again during the short

campaign of 1922 disappeared during the military operations of 1920-22, some of the texts have been taken from squeezes and photographs made at the time of finding. The relatively small number of inscriptions found on so famous a site is explained by the long time during which the precinct lay uncovered and by the local demand for building-stone.

The material is conveniently presented in five groups, the inscriptions of each group being arranged chronologically: Documents and Public Records, the most important group (1-20); Honorific Texts (21-84); Votive Texts and Dedications (85-101b); Sepulchral Inscriptions, by far the largest of all (102-176); and Miscellaneous Texts and Fragments (177-228). While no inscription of outstanding historical importance has been found, there are many, especially in Group 1, which are of value and interest. Thus No. 1, pp. 1-7, Pls. I-II, from a stone found inside the temple in 1910 and dating from c. 200 B. C., is republished from *AJA* XVI, 1912, 11-82. It describes a temple mortgage securing a loan on lands to a certain Mnesimachos and has interesting legal features. No. 8, the longest inscription in the book, pp. 16-27, Pl. IV, also republished from the same Journal, XVIII, 1914, 322-62, contains twelve documents concerning a certain Menogenes of Sardis which date from 5-1 B. C. — three letters, one from Augustus to the Sardians, and nine decrees of the commonalty of Asia or the Council of Sardis, an interesting record in the history of the Roman province of Asia.

The honorific texts refer to Roman emperors and their relatives—Tiberius (34), Claudius (39), Antoninus Pius (58), Septimius Severus (71 and 73), Severus Alexander (72), Drusus, son of Germanicus (33), Antonia, mother of Claudius (37), Faustina, wife of Marcus Aurelius (59)—or to prominent persons, *e. g.*, "The sacred head of Cicero" (49) dedicated in the middle of the second century, priestesses of Artemis (50-54) and Athena (55), a proconsul (36), a procurator (60), and various athletes. Among the later is a statue base inscribed on three sides in honor of a certain boxer and pancratiast, Demostratos Damas (79, a, b, c, pp. 83-7, Pl. XII, figs. 66-7) of the time of Caracalla. It was found in 1905 on the site of the ancient stadium and was first published by Keil and von Premerstein. From it and five other memorials of the same athlete found elsewhere, we learn that he was a professional pothunter—a common athletic figure in Roman days—who boasted

of twenty victories as a boy and forty-eight as a man, and withal that he was a *periodonikes*, or winner of prizes at all four national games of Greece at least twice.

The sepulchral inscriptions come from stelae, slabs, gravestones, tombs, vases, lids of cinerary urns, chests, and sarcophagi, and include epitaphs to soldiers (140-1), a physician (142), a gladiator (162), etc. Several are Christian dating down as far as the tenth or eleventh centuries. A slab, now lost, but known from copies made by Cockerell in 1811 and Rayet in 1874, presents a good example of a pagan curse (152, figs. 136-7), which calls down on an enemy the wrath of all the gods, the loss of property and eyesight, and concludes, " may utter perdition befall him after death ". A Christian imprecation is against anyone else being buried in the owner's tomb (164, fig. 150). The miscellaneous inscriptions are from various objects—temple slabs, column drums, tiles (177-186), a boundary stone (191), a table-leg (192), earthenware lamps, jars, shoes, utensils, etc. (219-25). Some are Christian (188-90) and one on a doorjamb, discovered in 1919 (187, fig. 174), is in both Greek and Latin, and memorializes a Jewess of the third or fourth century.

There are seven excellent indexes (pp. 171-194) and a concordance (pp. 195-8). The plates and text-cuts are distinct and the Greek font used throughout the text is easily read. Typographical errors are almost non-existent, and the scholarly way in which the epigraphical work has been done certainly reverses the recently expressed opinion of Sir William Ramsay about one of the distinguished authors. It is valuable to have so accurate an edition of all known Sardian inscriptions in such available form.

Pt. 2 will contain, together with *testimonia* relating to Sardis, the *Diaries of Robt. Wood and his Friends*, notes taken at Sardis in 1750 and now in the library of the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, and the plates necessary to illustrate them.

Walter Woodburn Hyde.

University of Pennsylvania.

Origin and Growth of Caste in India. By N. K. Dutt. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Company, Ltd., 1931. Pp. xi + 310.

Caste and Race in India. By G. S. Ghurye. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1932. Pp. 209.

Indian Caste Customs. By L. S. S. O'Malley. Cambridge: University Press, 1932. Pp. ix + 190.

Professor Dutt has undertaken to survey the literature of Brahmanism for the purpose of discovering the origin and tracing the development of the caste system of India. His completed work will comprise three volumes (of which this is the first), covering the periods 2,000 B. C. to 300 B. C., 300 B. C. to 1200 A. D. and 1200 A. D. to 1900 A. D. The literature covered in the first volume includes the Veda and the Sūtras. A chapter is added giving "Verifications from non-Brahmanical Writings," which includes "Caste in Early Buddhist Literature" and "Caste in Greek Accounts." Taking into consideration the wide social implications of the caste system, the author covers a considerable number of topics for each literary period. These subjects are: pretentions of the Brahmans, the changing status of the Vāiśya, the Dāsa-Śūdra, food and drink, rules of marriage, child marriage, remarriage of women, position of women, ceremonial purity, defilement by touch, and legal rights of women.

The author rejects Risley's theory of the Persian origin of the caste idea. Senart's position that caste is the normal development of ancient Aryan institutions is questioned on the grounds that *gotra* is only one form of exogamy; and that the restrictions on inter-caste or inter-class marriage, the idea of pollution by touch with the lower classes, and the prohibition of inter-caste dining were absent in the earlier *Vedic* period. History shows, he says, that the development of inter-caste marriage restrictions was principally due to local racial differences. Cultural and tribal differences were influential in India even before the arrival of the Āryans, as "between the civilized Dravidians and the savage pre-Dravidians." "Thus the practices of the conquered aborigines contributed as much to the development of caste as the racial and class prejudices of the Aryan conquerers."

In the Rig Veda the constant association of the names of priests

and kings in the hymns bespeaks a somewhat closer relation between the two higher classes, while a much wider gulf divides the Brahmans from the commoners, the Vāiśyas. The widest division lay between the three Aryan groups and the fourth. Other differences "were nothing compared with those which distinguished ethnically and culturally the Aryans . . . from the Dāsas or Dasyus." Gradually a humane principle was evolved which relegated the Dasyu to service rather than to death. In later times Śūdra denoted slave. Yet there is no evidence that the Śūdras were regarded as unclean. In the Rig Veda *gotra* never denotes a clan or gens. Two forms of marriage only were forbidden, in both cases to prevent incest. Mixed castes were not yet formed, nor is there mention of a fifth, or untouchable, caste. Child marriage is not mentioned and there was no aversion to the remarriage of women. Polyandry went out of fashion, but polygamy continued common. Woman was a sort of chattel, yet, relatively (to later times), she was not degraded. In religious ceremonies she was an equal partner with her husband.

With the Brāhmaṇas the priest becomes a master of ceremonies; the Śūdra becomes a serf; savage tribes, very low in the scale of civilization and with revolting habits and standards of living, begin to form a new order, a fifth *varṇa*. Large numbers of Aryans, partly through mixture of blood and partly on account of their employment along with Śūdras in industrial professions, eventually found place as mixed castes. Emphasis is laid upon special rules "prescribed for the guidance of the different castes, which tended, by making the different classes conform to different habits, rules of etiquette, etc., to widen the separation between the different castes even among the community of the Aryan conquerors." Barriers thus raised between classes were particularly effective against the Vāiśyas, who were being assimilated to the Śūdra as forming a group over against the Brahman and Kṣatriya. Their (Vāiśya) blood was contaminated on a large scale. On the other hand, as the aboriginal groups became part of the social order, the Śūdra's position was enhanced. Definite groups of the pre-Dravidian outcastes are mentioned, such as Caṇḍāla and Pāulkasa. Exogamy becomes a practice. The woman and the Śūdra are grouped together as embodying impurity. In this period "we come across for the first time mentions of ceremonial purity and impurity attaching to cer-

tain persons or castes on sacrificial grounds. This arose out of the distinction between the initiated and the uninitiated, the non-Aryans being uninitiated and unendowed with the sacrificial girdle."

The period of the Sūtras is full of significance. "The principal distinction . . . is that between the twice-born and the once-born, which though practically retaining the old distinctions between the conquerers and the natives, was more sacramental and social than racial. . . . The gaps between the major orders of society were greatly widened." Kṣatriya now means not only ruling class but also the occupation of fighting. Not all warriors are Kṣatriyas. The status of the Śūdra is much improved. The line of demarcation between the occupations of Vāiśyas and Śūdras grows fainter. Rules regarding defilement are elaborated, hedging in the liberty of the higher castes. With this go new restrictions about food, and vegetarianism is on the increase. Still, food cooked by Śūdras is not objectionable. There is emphasis on actions causing loss of caste, including certain social relationships, sea voyages, dealing in forbidden merchandise, serving Śūdras, *prati-loma* marriages involving Śūdra women. Early marriage becomes more desirable. "The marriage of widows, though not entirely prohibited, is spoken of disapprovingly by all the law givers."

In the final chapter an interesting comment is made by the author: "The early Buddhist writings practically confirm the description of the Brahman caste as given in the Sūtras and concede to the Brahmans the three exclusive privileges of teaching, performing sacrifices for others, and receiving gifts." We find close relations between Brahmans and Kṣatriyas. "The words Vessa and Sudda occur very seldom in the Jātaka literature and are used only when a theoretical discussion of the caste system is made, and not to mean existing social groups." Untouchables are unknown in this literature.

This volume contains a comprehensive and thorough study of the literature under review.

Dr. Ghurye, in his study of caste, has a different aim from that of Dr. Dutt. He brings anthropological data to bear upon the element of *race* in caste. He covers the whole of the Brahmanic literature in two chapters under the title: "Caste through the Ages." Both of the writers are in fair agreement in their con-

clusions. However, Dr. Ghurye holds that the accounts of mixed castes do not accord with the facts: "We have opined that the theory of mixed castes, as expanded by the contemporary writers, marks the numerous groups that had come into existence."

The author introduces much ethnographical data yielding many informing sidelights on the history of the castes and making for human interest. After describing the well-known outstanding features of the caste system, Dr. Ghurye goes on to say of the divisions of society: "If we are to take some kind of Indian sentiment as our guide in our analysis, then, as according to the orthodox theory on this matter there are only two or at most three castes, Brahman and Śūdra, or at the most three, where the existence of the Kṣatriya is grudgingly granted." And he adds, "There is ample reason why, to get a sociologically correct idea of the institution, we should recognize sub-castes as real castes." "The status in the hierarchy of any sub-caste depends upon the status of the caste, from which follow the various civil and religious rights and disabilities, and the traditional occupation is determined by the nature of the caste. The other three features, which are very material in the consideration of a group from the point of view of an effective social life, viz., those that regulate communal life and prescribe rules as regard feeding, social intercourse and endogamy, belong to the sub-caste."

In his chapter on "Race and Caste," the author reviews the various theories that have been proposed by European writers, and makes a study of anthropometrical data. He is here on uncertain and difficult ground. He finds that the Brahman of the United Provinces does not differ materially from the physical type of the Panjab. "The Chamār and the Pāsi, whom we may look upon as the Hinduised representatives of the aborigines, stand far removed from him (the Brahman of the United Provinces). This is just the situation that should have resulted from the regulations which were being promulgated by the Brahmans to avoid their class being contaminated by the infusion of the aboriginal blood. The evidence from the literature is thus amply corroborated by the physical facts. Restrictions on marriage of a fundamentally endogamous nature were thus racial in origin." "It is not necessary to postulate a second invasion of the Aryans, who could not bring their women folk with them. Nor need we propose a theory entirely contradictory to the literary records of the Brahmans." Moreover, "In

Hindustan . . . the gradation of physical types from the Brahman downwards to Musahar corresponds very closely to the scheme of social precedence prevailing among the Hindustani castes. This state of things can be the result only of such regulations that prevented the possibility of Brahman blood being mixed with aboriginal blood but allowed the mixture of blood of the other groups in varying proportions. As we have seen, this is just what the Brahmans attempted to do by their rules of conduct." "The Brahmanistic practice of endogamy must have been developed in Hindustan and thence conveyed as a cultural trait to the other areas without a large influx of the physical type of the Hindustani Brahmans."

The beginnings of the Indian system rest in the movement against the Śūdra debarring him from religious worship and debarring his women from marriage with the Aryans. The opposition between Ārya and Dāsa is replaced by that between twice-born and once-born. Then exaggerated notions of social impurity and meticulous restrictions in ritual arose. Restrictions on food and water widen the gulf which separates the Brahman from others. With the assimilation of the Vāiśya to the Śūdra, Vāiśya females are assigned a different status. Restrictions in marriage aim at preservation of purity of blood. Functional differentiation in society issues in separate occupational groups with more or less distinct interests. Occupations became endogenous groups. Customary etiquette becomes a mark of caste distinction. Special rights are gained for the higher classes and disabilities for the lower.

Mr. O'Malley does not undertake to investigate either the racial or the historical aspects of the system of caste. Rather, he deals with the Indian social order as a living institution and examines it from the standpoint of living custom. In other words, he shows how caste functions, how custom supplies sanctions and regulations for its every-day, every-contingency need. Consequently he deals not with theory but with fact. The chapter headings suggest the range and the method of his treatment: "Caste Government," "External Control," "Penalties," "Marriage and Morals," "Food and Drink," "Occupations," "The Untouchables," and "Modern Tendencies." This excellent volume shows what caste looks like and how it handles the social and economic problems of the day. It presents the Western reader with brief and accurate answers to

many of his questions. Nowhere else in such concise and accurate terms can be found an account of the every-day life of the Indian under caste-regulation.

The Keys of Power. By J. Abbott, B. A. (Oxon.). New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, Inc., 1932. Pp. xi + 560.

The primitive belief in power (*śakti, kudrat*); the various concepts of a diffused, supernatural, cosmic power found in objects animate and inanimate, in words, in man, and in superior beings; the conviction that it has possibilities for good and evil; the possession of merit (*puṇya*) which results from its good effects; and the techniques for its control, form the framework for the mass of detailed information which fills the pages of this most interesting volume. This power is described as it is found in man, woman, the evil eye, ground, water, fire, metals, salt, stones, time, colors, numbers, sweet things, trees, weather, ritual of agriculture, grain, bread, animals, spirits, curses, and oaths. The author extends the discussion to the invocation of power, totemism and the Marāthā "Devak" and the destruction of power. Appendices deal with Hindu and Muhammadan charms, Hindu festivals on which certain forms of *himsā* are forbidden or allowed, *utāra* in the Deccan, restrictions on inter-marriage between *kul* of the Kātkarīs and the power of the cardinal points. The keys of power are the techniques evolved for its control. The volume is a veritable storehouse of information, drawn from the common life of western India and Sind, almost every sentence of which is a separate item bearing upon some aspect of the subject. The book is a most excellent example of first-hand, carefully organized work in the field of folklore.

George W. Briggs.

Drew University.

Somanātha and Other Mediaeval temples in Kāṭhiāwāḍ. By Henry Cousens. Calcutta: Archaeological Survey of India, Imperial Series, Vol. XLV, 1931. Pp. 92, 106 Plates.

This is another of Mr. Cousens' sketchy compilations, constituting an impressive volume containing hardly anything new. How much more useful would have been an entire volume devoted to the temple at Gop, and the related types at Bileśvara, Vīsāvāda, etc.! Gop and Vileśvara are each dismissed in a single page: the two old photographs of Gop are reproduced, where we ought to have had a dozen plates illustrating detail. The discussion is often uninformed, for example, when the piled up window niches of reduplicated roofing elements are treated (p. 7), as prototypes of the superimposed arch forms of the so-called "temple symbol" ("chaitya symbol" of older numismatologists) on early Indian coins: without regard to the fact that it has been shown repeatedly that this is a "mountain symbol," or to the fact that its appearance on coins antedates by many centuries the later development of pyramidal roofing by reduplication, from which it is supposed to be derived. The description of the installation of a Jaina image (p. 82 f.), is more poetical than informing. In the glossary, there are misprints (śivatsa, sabha-maṇḍapa, Samkara, Rāvi, etc.), and errors of definition: *makara,* "probably the rhinoceros" is ludicrous (at least five major discussions of the *makara* have been published within the last few years), *cholī* is a bodice rather than a jacket, the "arched-roofed caves of the Buddhists" are not *chaitya* but *chaitya-gṛha,* nor is a *chaitya* anything specifically Buddhist, but any object of cult worship, more often than not a sacred tree.

Catalogue of the South Indian Metal Images in the Madras Government Museum. By F. H. Gravely and T. N. Ramachandran. Madras: Bull. Madras Government Museum, Vol. I, Pt. 2, 1932. Pp. 144 and 23 Plates.

The authors and the Museum are to be congratulated on this welcome issue. The Madras collections of South Indian images are by far the largest and in many respects the best assembled in any one place. The Catalogue makes known many which had hitherto

been unpublished, and illustrates all with adequate iconographic description and identification.

The discussion of the dating, despite the indefiniteness of the conclusions, constitutes a real advance in comprehension of the stylistic development. No example can be shown to be of Pallava date, though the school may be thought of as ultimately of Pallava origin; images for which a late Pallava date have been claimed with some show of plausibility are Mr. Treasurywala's Pārvatī, published by Kramrisch in *Rūpam,* April, 1930, and the far finer Pārvatī or Queen in the Freer Gallery, published by myself in *Rūpam,* January, 1930, and *Pantheon,* Vol. VI, 1930 (this image may well be earlier than the date suggested, about 1100 A. D.). Only one known example bears an actual date, that is Naṭeśa No. 2. (Pl. XVI, fig. 2) from Belūr, of date equivalent to A. D. 1510/11; this example is not far removed stylistically from those of the "Chola type." This "Chola type" is established (p. 30 f.) on the basis of the palaeography, details, and associations of four inscribed images, viz. Kālī No. 6 (Pl. XIV, fig. 1), two effigies at Kalahasti (published by Aravamuthan, *Portrait Sculpture in South India,* 1931, pp. 37, 41, figs. 12, 16), and a Candraśekhara in the Musée Guimet (Pl. XII, figs. 1, 2); a group of inscribed Buddhist images from Negapatam (to be published in a subsequent *Bulletin*); and images from Śiva Devāle No. 5, Poḷonnāruva, Ceylon (my *Bronzes from Ceylon,* Mem. Colombo Museum, A I, 1914). This type is "incompletely conventionalised" and characterised by "a smooth roundness in the treatment of the face" and "simplicity of decorative detail," especially as regards the necklaces, which are broad and circular rather than elongated; the group is further predominantly Śaiva. Jouveau-Dubreuil's earlier conclusions with respect to the stylistic development mainly of Vaiṣṇava images are conveniently tabulated (p. 41), and in the main confirmed. The development of more elaborated types takes place about the beginning of the Vijayanagar period, but no hard and fast lines can be drawn.

A. K. Coomaraswamy.

Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

NOTES OF THE SOCIETY

At the Society's meetings in New York the Directors appropriated money for the publication of monographs. Such material should be submitted at once to the editors of the JOURNAL, at Box 17, Bennett Hall, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

AN EXPLANATION

In consequence of a misunderstanding of the editors of this JOURNAL, the editors of *Eastern Art*, and Baron A. von Staël-Holstein, the JOURNAL published in Volume 52, part 4 (December, 1932) an article by Baron von Staël-Holstein entitled "Notes on Two Lama Paintings" at the same time when a revised version of the same article entitled "On Two Tibetan Pictures representing Some of the Spiritual Ancestors of the Dalai Lama and of the Paṇchen Lama" appeared in the *Bulletin of the National Library of Peiping*, December, 1932.

American Oriental Society

THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY was founded in 1842 for the promotion of Oriental studies, the encouragement of research in Eastern languages and literatures, and the publication of books and papers dealing with these subjects. It is not necessary for any one to be a professed Orientalist in order to become a member. All persons—men or women—who are in sympathy with the objects of the Society are invited to give it their help in the furthering of its work. Persons desiring to become members are requested to apply to the Corresponding Secretary, Professor LEROY C. BARRET, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. Members receive the Journal without charge. The annual assessment is $5. For the terms of life membership see By-Law VI as printed in this JOURNAL, Vol. 51, p. 377.

CAPITALIZED FUNDS

Charles W. Bradley Fund	$3000	William Dwight Whitney Fund	$1000
Alexander I. Cotheal Fund	1500	Life Membership Fund	3800
		I. M. Casanowicz Fund	$150

The attention of the members of the Society is especially called to these Funds, the interest of which is used towards defraying the Society's expenses of publication. Gifts or legacies for this purpose will mean much for Oriental research in America. The corporate title of the Society is THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY (incorporated under the laws of Massachusetts).

LIBRARY

The Society's Library is deposited with the Library of Yale University, where its volumes may be consulted by members and by other persons receiving the permission of the Librarian. A catalog has been prepared, and is now available in printed form for distribution to the members of the Society; it may be had for one dollar, plus postage, from the Librarian (Professor Andrew Keogh, The Library, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.). The facilities of the Library are available to members wherever they may be located, and the Librarian is ready to lend such books as are needed. He will be pleased to receive documents relating to the history of the Society, particularly letters of distinguished former members. (See vol. 51, p. 378 of the JOURNAL for By-laws relating to the Library; vol. 52, p. 277 for the last Report of the Librarian.)

J. H. FURST CO., PRINTERS, BALTIMORE

Journal of the American Oriental Society

Now issued quarterly. Subscription price, $6.00; for Libraries ordering direct from the Publishers, $5.00. Single numbers, $1.50. Prices of back volumes and parts, so far as not out of print, will be sent on application. Members of the Society and Libraries are allowed 20% discount from list prices on back numbers.

American Oriental Series

Volume 1. A Grammar of the Tagalog Language. By Frank R. Blake. Price (bound), $6.00.

Volumes 2 and 3. The Panchatantra Reconstructed. An attempt to establish the lost original Sanskrit text of the most famous of Indian story-collections on the basis of the principal extant versions. Text, Critical Apparatus, Introduction, Translation. By Franklin Edgerton. 1924. Price (bound), $12.00 for the two volumes; not sold separately.

Library of Ancient Semitic Inscriptions

Volume 1. The Royal Inscriptions of Sumer and Akkad. By George A. Barton. Price (bound), $6.50.

SEPARATE PRINTS FROM THE JOURNAL

Dwight, H. G. O., Catalogue of works in the Armenian language prior to the seventeenth century	$5.00
Khanikoff, N., Book of the Balance of Wisdom	5.00
Paspati, Memoir on the language of the Gypsies in the Turkish Empire	5.00
Gulick, L. H., Panape Dialect	2.50
Whitney's Tāittirīya-Prātiçākhya	6.00
Avery's Sanskrit Verb-Inflection	3.00
Whitney's Index Verborum to the Atharva-Veda	6.00
The same on large paper	8.00
Oertel's Jāiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa	2.50
Arnold's Historical Vedic Grammar	2.50
Bloomfield's Kāuçika-Sūtra of the Atharva-Veda	8.00
Hopkins, Social and Military Position of the Ruling Caste in Ancient India	3.00
The Whitney Memorial Volume (vol. 19, part 1), with portrait and bibliography, buckram	3.00
Index to Volumes 21-40	1.00

ADDRESS THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY, THE PUBLISHERS, CARE OF

YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS

NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT, U. S. A.